

There are very few responsible and thoughtful persons in the world who do not recognize that the United States, no longer in a position to absorb the large number of immigrants who were so essential to its growth during the 19th century, must now maintain a system of selective and regulated migration. The primary defect of our immigration policy as viewed by foreigners is not that it is restrictive, not even that it admits too few each year, but that it is based on false, discredited, or unjust principles.

Any comprehensive reexamination of American immigration policy must begin with a renewed declaration of basic American principles: That one group of citizens in a world now drawn together by hope and fear is not to be favored as more desirable than another group; that no American policy or legislation shall be based directly on race or national origins; that American citizens are not to be classified for the rest of their lives into two groups of widely differing rights and privileges, the native born and the naturalized; and that no program should encourage arbitrary, inhumane administrative machinery inexorably grinding out its decisions in terms of cold statutes and statistics without regard for human values and emotions.

I do not say that there should be no preference exercised, no distinctions made, no differences recognized. In a nation desperately short of engineering, scientific, medical, and other skills, I would rather see us give a preference to an immigrant because he is a nuclear physicist than because he is an Anglo-Saxon. I would rather see us admit those whose husbands or wives, parents or children have long awaited their coming to this country than those whose only claim to preference is the accidental color of their skin and hair. I would like to see us give preference to those who are refugees from religious or political persecution, or who have found conditions of residence in their country intolerable, those whose frustrating, poverty-stricken existence in a refugee camp only serves to feed the mills of Communist propaganda.

There may well be other categories to which we should give preference if our immigration policies are to be responsive to the real and current needs of our national interest. To fulfill this goal it may be necessary to establish an annual immigration quota, reflecting the current world conditions and American economic trends, and subject to a review by the Congress at periodic intervals to evaluate its effects on our Nation's economy and foreign relations.

Finally, any such reevaluation of immigration policy must streamline our administrative procedures in this area. We must be sure that they conform to reasonable standards of justice and that they do not vest excessive arbitrary power in the hands of overworked and harassed officials. Our very form of government is based upon a recognition of the principle that men are fallible, that checks and balances are necessary at every step and that those who have been denied visas, for example, ought to have some right of appeal.

The McCarran-Walter Act was passed over Presidential veto and there is no reason to believe that it is possible for us to change all of its features. We have to realize that we have to be conscious always of what it is possible for us to do. Therefore, I believe it absolutely essential, first of all, that we follow up our humanitarian admission of 30,000 Hungarian refugees of the great revolt by regularizing their status here, by changing it from that of parolees to holders of permanent visas, which will enable them to set out on the road toward citizenship.

Second. We should redistribute the annual quotas which today are wasted, either by administrative board who will take into account the needs of the United States and of the countries involved, or through redistribution on a proportionate basis to all countries having less than a quota of 7,000 each year.

Third. I believe that Congress should grant discretionary power to the executive branch to provide exceptions from the provisions of law in certain hardship cases.

Fourth. I am concerned that our immigration law with its quota set essentially on national or ethnic lines may well in operation have prevented the movement to this country of skilled workers and especially scientists and engineers who are so badly needed. Therefore, I propose to establish a pool of nonquota visas when it is determined that a visa is not ordinarily available to persons possessing skills essential to our national interests.

There are no easy solutions to these problems that will not bring new difficulties and displeasures with them, but neither are they easy problems. For whether we like it or not, whether we tell them to stay or not, there will always be Hungarians fleeing from Budapest, Jews leaving Warsaw, Italians leaving the poverty of their villages. In the words of the Irish poet at the time of the great Irish exodus induced by both famine and oppression:

"They are going, going, going, and we cannot bid them stay
For their fields are now the stranger's where the stranger's cattle stray,
But no foreign skies hold beauty like the rainy skies they knew.
Nor any night-wind cool the brow as did the foggy dew."

I do not predict with any certainty that we shall obtain such a comprehensive reexamination and revision of our immigration laws during the coming year. But I do say that such a step cannot be far away—that the course of human events proves conclusively that bigotry eventually gives way to knowledge, expediency yields to humanitarianism, repression gives way to liberty. The day cannot be far off when America will again have an immigration policy that all men can call fair, that all in need will deem generous. We want a policy that was best described by Stephen Wise in that memorable keynote address to the preliminary conference of the American Jewish Congress in 1916, when he said that "the only program worthy of a great and proud people . . . is not relief—but redress; not palliation—but prevention; not charity—but justice."

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 30, 1958

(Legislative day of Monday, January 27, 1958)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. William E. Trice, D. D., pastor, the University Methodist Church, Baton Rouge, La., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of outer space and inner man: Cut through the redtape of our confused human thinking with the searing sacredness of Thy truth, that we may be commanded by the necessity of doing Thy will.

Light up our consciousness, O God of justice, with the knowledge of our accountable responsibility to Thee. Defend us, O God of power, from the evils of our age, to the extent of our faithfulness to Thy way. Let us be unafraid, O God of peace, of any heavenly body save one launched by Thine infinite power. Bend our wills to fit the pattern of Thy purposes.

Then, may Thy benediction, at last, be as surely deserved by our actions as it is freely given by Thy grace, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 29, 1958, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 439) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Seventh International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted with out payment of tariff, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the

enrolled bill (H. R. 8216) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to prevent unjust enrichment by precluding refunds of alcohol and tobacco taxes to persons who have not borne the ultimate burden of the tax, and it was signed by the Vice President.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, Mr. THURMOND was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate, because of a death in his family.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. PASTORE, and by unanimous consent, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of U. Alexis Johnson, of California, to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Thailand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Anthony F. Arpaia, of Connecticut, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1964.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Rupert L. Murphy, of Georgia, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1964.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Abe McGregor Goff, of Idaho, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1959.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to tell the Senate of my great approval of the nomination of my old friend and colleague, the Hon. Abe McGregor Goff, to be a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

A better man could not have been chosen for this position. The State of Idaho, the Northwest, and the Nation as a whole can be proud that this man of integrity and decency has been so highly honored. I wish him the best of everything in the challenging position which he now will occupy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Coast Guard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business, with statements limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON MILITARY PRIME CONTRACTS WITH BUSINESS FIRMS IN THE UNITED STATES FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, AND RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military prime contracts with business firms in the United States for experimental, developmental, and research work (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF THE PRESIDENT TO ENTER INTO CERTAIN TRADE AGREEMENTS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, his report, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF HOUSING AUTHORITY OF CITY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles, Calif., 1956, Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, his report

for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PUBLICATION ENTITLED "STATISTICS OF ELECTRIC UTILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES, 1956, PRIVATELY OWNED COMPANIES"

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of its recently issued publication entitled "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, 1956, Privately Owned Companies" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 4083, TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO PENITENTIARY IMPRISONMENT

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 4083, title 18, United States Code, relating to penitentiary imprisonment (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON POSITIONS FILLED IN CERTAIN GRADES OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions filled in the General Accounting Office under the Classification Act of 1949, in grades GS-16, 17, and 18 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Iron County, Wis., favoring the placing of a tariff on all iron ore, steel, copper, plywood, and pulpwood imported into the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Michael Osborne Cunningham, of Hilo, Hawaii, praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on Finance.

RESOLUTION OF RHODE ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and myself, I present a certified copy of resolution H. 1010, passed by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, at the January session, 1958. This resolution is entitled "Resolution Urging the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, and the Tariff Commission To Enact and Maintain Tariff Rates on Textile Imports."

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution urging the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, and the Tariff Commission to enact and maintain tariff rates on textile imports

Whereas manufacturing is the foundation of the Rhode Island economy; and

Whereas the Rhode Island textile industry represents about 30 percent of all manufacturing employment and a total investment of \$800 million; and

Whereas imports of textiles, particularly woollens and worsteds, seriously affect the manufacturers of domestic goods; and

Whereas recent studies by the United States Bureau of Labor statistics indicate the large wage differential between foreign and domestic producers places American manufacturers at a decided competitive disadvantage; and

Whereas the continued decline in textiles has caused a loss of 34,000 jobs in 10 years with unemployment resulting: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President of the United States be urged to insist on increasing and maintaining proper tariff and quota protection on the imports of woolen and worsted textiles; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States and in particular the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives take every legislative precaution in enacting proper legislation to ensure the creation and maintenance of proper tariff rates on textile imports; and be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of State to the President of the United States, to the Tariff Commission of the United States, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance and to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and to the Members of Congress from the State of Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, earnestly requesting that each use his best efforts to bring about the enactment and maintenance of tariff and quota rates on the import of textile goods to the end that the manufacture and sale of such goods in the United States are not jeopardized.

REPORT ENTITLED "TAX PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS" (S. REPT. NO. 1237)

Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Select Committee on Small Business, submitted a report of that committee entitled "Tax Problems of Small Business," which was ordered to be printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KERR, Mr. IVES, Mr. MORSE, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. HENNING, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. GREEN, Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MONROE, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LONG, Mr. CARROLL, and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 3187. A bill to strengthen the national defense, advance the cause of peace, and assure the intellectual preeminence of the United States, especially in science and technology, through programs designed to stimulate the development and to increase the number of students in science, engineering, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other disciplines and to provide additional facilities for the teaching thereof; to promote the development of technical skills essential to the national defense; to assist teachers to increase their knowledge and improve their effectiveness; to inform our scientists promptly and effectively of the results of research and study carried on in the United States and throughout the world;

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HILL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself, Mr. MORSE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. PROXMIER, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 3188. A bill to prohibit discrimination because of age in the hiring and employment of persons by Government contractors; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 3189. A bill to modify the general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Missouri River Basin in order to provide for certain payments to the cities of Mandan and Bismarck, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 3190. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorating the 75th anniversary of the founding of the University of Texas; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 3191. A bill to create a Small Business Capital Bank System to make available to small business a source of equity and long-term loan capital where such capital is not available on reasonable terms from existing private sources; to transfer to such system all funds which are presently available under section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act for loans to industrial and commercial firms, together with certain other funds out of the surplus accounts of the Federal Reserve banks; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 3192. A bill for the relief of Edeltraud Maria Theresia Collom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 3193. A bill for the relief of Vincent R. Gonzales; to the Committee on the Judiciary. (See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. THYE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. HOBLITZEL):

S. 3194. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to establish an initial program of tax adjustment for small and independent business and for persons engaged in small and independent business; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

DESIGNATION OF YEAR 1960 AS "VISIT U. S. A. YEAR"

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators BEALL, FULBRIGHT, FLANDERS, HOLLAND, HUMPHREY, IVES, POTTER, and WILEY, I submit a concurrent resolution calling upon President Eisenhower to proclaim 1960 as "Visit U. S. A. Year." The concurrent resolution further requests the President to call upon all agencies and departments of Government as well as private organizations and individuals in the United States, to cooperate in encouraging per-

sons from foreign countries to visit the United States. A companion concurrent resolution is being submitted in the House today by 10 Members from both sides of the aisle.

"Visit U. S. A. Year" is a natural and highly desirable followup to the President's invitation inviting foreign visitors here "as a vital step in the direction of international understanding and world peace." In addition, in light of the new agreement on cultural exchanges between ourselves and the Soviet Union, setting aside a special year in which to encourage international travel has the added advantage of furthering the aims embodied in the exchange agreement—expanded interchange of ideas, mutual understanding, stimulation of foreign trade and improvement of the domestic economy. Travel is an important source of revenue and can become even more important both to the United States and to other nations. In 1956 the 1,243,000 Americans who traveled abroad outside of Canada and Mexico spent about \$1,275 million, a little more than half of that in free Europe itself. Approximately 350,000 persons from areas outside Canada and Mexico traveled in the United States, and spent \$750 million here.

I believe that the resolution will emphasize the importance of Federal participation in the promotion of world travel, both as a spur to business and as a component of our foreign policy. Most foreign governments maintain a national tourist or travel office and in our own country, 43 of the 48 States maintain official State travel promotion offices. Furthermore, tourism ranks among the first 5 principal industries of the 48 States. By direction of the President and pursuant to section 7 (m) of the Mutual Security Act of 1957, Presidential Assistant Clarence Randall, head of the President's Committee on Facilitation and Promotion of International Travel, is conducting a study, with the cooperation of the various executive departments concerned, as well as private enterprise, of the barriers to international travel and ways and means of promoting, developing, encouraging, and facilitating such travel in the mutual interests of the United States and our free world friends.

The results of this study should aid greatly in the finding of means to encourage and facilitate this international travel, so important in terms of strengthening bonds between peoples.

However, in the meantime, while awaiting those results, we should extend the hand of welcome to people in foreign countries and encourage them to visit the United States. We are confronted by many problems in that connection, such as foreign exchange and the cost of travel, and so forth, but the auspices provided by the concurrent resolution will give us a real opportunity to make immeasurable progress toward our putting out a real welcome mat for all people in the world who wish to see how we live and what we really are like. I trust the concurrent resolution will receive prompt approval.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 59), submitted by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators), was received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas the President, in a letter extensively circulated throughout the world in seven languages, has cordially invited foreign visitors to this country and in so doing stated: "America welcomes visits of those from abroad as a vital step in the direction of international understanding and world peace"; and

Whereas 43 of the 48 States maintain official State travel promotion offices and tourism ranks among the first 5 principal industries of each of the 48 United States; and

Whereas visits by foreign residents to the United States, its Territories, and possessions provide for an expanded interchange of ideas, increased mutual understanding, stimulation of foreign trade and improvement of the domestic economy; and

Whereas more than 350,000 individuals from foreign nations other than our immediate neighbors of Canada and Mexico visit the United States annually; and

Whereas improved financial and political conditions in most foreign nations now make it possible for nationals of these countries to visit the United States in increasing numbers; and

Whereas international and domestic travel organizations, both commercial and governmental, are working to promote travel to and within the United States during 1960 when new jet airliners, modern ships and units of the national highway system are due to be placed in service and other new tourist facilities, services, celebrations, and attractions will be offered as additional inducements to visit the United States: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is requested to issue a proclamation designating the year 1960 as "Visit U. S. A. Year," and to call upon all agencies and departments of the Government as well as private organizations and individuals in the United States to cooperate during such year in encouraging people from foreign countries to visit the United States.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleagues, Senators SPARKMAN, FULBRIGHT, MURRAY, PASTORE, LANGER, HUMPHREY, KERR, IVES, MORSE, KEFAUVER, JACKSON, HENNINGS, SCOTT, YARBOROUGH, SYMINGTON, MAGNUSON, GREEN, PROXMIER, CHAVEZ, MONRONEY, DOUGLAS, MANSFIELD, KENNEDY, LONG, CARROLL, and NEUBERGER, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill entitled "National Defense Education Act of 1958."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3187) to strengthen the national defense, advance the cause of peace, and assure the intellectual preeminence of the United States, especially in science and technology, through programs designed to stimulate the development and to increase the number of students in science, engineering, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other disciplines, and to provide additional facilities for the teaching thereof;

to promote the development of technical skills essential to the national defense; to assist teachers to increase their knowledge and improve their effectiveness; to inform our scientists promptly and effectively of the results of research and study carried on in the United States and throughout the world; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, Americans have always been proud of our educational system, and rightly so. We are especially proud of the hundreds of thousands of dedicated men and women teachers, administrators, counselors, and others who each year give so much of themselves to the education of our youth.

Recent events, however, have dramatically demonstrated that the education of our youth is a matter of grave concern to all. This was forcefully testified to in public hearings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare by Dr. Werner von Braun, the famous missile expert, and by Dr. Edward Teller, the father of the H-bomb. Dr. von Braun said that the education and training of scientists and other personnel is a matter of national survival. Dr. Teller said "This we have to do or our way of life will not survive." We read every day of the large number of Soviet scientists and engineers who are being graduated to take their places in the Soviet machine, aimed at world domination. That Soviet educational efforts in science have been successful is testified to by Sputniks I and II. Only this morning Dr. Teller told the committee that "There is every indication that leadership in science is slipping out of the hands of the United States into the hands of the Russians."

The Federal Government, from the very beginning, has had the responsibility, under our Constitution, for providing for the national defense. The needs of national defense require that the Federal Government act at this time to stimulate and encourage local and State educational agencies in efforts to increase the depth and broaden the scope of their educational programs. We must and can discharge this responsibility without interfering with State and local control and administration of education.

Mr. President, the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is based on three fundamental principles:

First, State and local communities have and must retain control over and primary responsibility for public education.

Second. In the present emergency, the national defense requires Federal assistance to stimulate States, local communities, schools, colleges, and universities, teachers, and individual students through a broad program designed to insure world scientific supremacy for the United States.

Third. The Nation must have a balanced education program. To achieve this, greater emphasis must be placed in the years ahead on the quality of education in the sciences, mathematics, engineering, foreign languages and the tech-

nical skills essential to the Nation's defense.

Mr. President, the bill presents a well-rounded program of emergency assistance designed to stimulate and assist education at all levels. Although the bill in its present form is the result of many months of consultations with some of America's foremost scientists and educators, we recognize that the problem is of such wide scope and so vital to the defense of the Nation that valuable additions, revisions, and modifications may possibly result from the hearings now in progress before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an analysis of the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

This title contains the finds and declaration of policy on which the bill is based, a prohibition of Federal control of education, and a section setting forth the definitions of terms used throughout the bill.

TITLE II—NATIONAL DEFENSE SCHOLARSHIPS

Forty thousand new, 4-year scholarships will be granted each year for 6 years to high-school graduates selected solely on the basis of merit by State commissions on scholarships and student loans, with special consideration being given to students with superior capacity and preparation in science, mathematics, or modern foreign languages. The scholarships will entitle the recipients to a grant of \$1,000 for each year of the scholarship.

Twenty thousand additional scholarships, to be granted on a similar basis, are authorized for the first year of the program to go to students who are already attending college and who are therefore ineligible to compete for national defense scholarships.

TITLE III—NATIONAL DEFENSE STUDENT LOANS

Forty million dollars are authorized for each of 6 years for loans to needy college students in amounts not exceeding \$1,000 per student per year. Preference is given to students whose academic background indicates superior capacity and preparation in science, mathematics, engineering, or foreign languages. The loan is repayable at 2 percent interest, starting 1 year after completion of higher education, and must be repaid within 10 years. If, however, the borrower serves as a full-time teacher, the loan is canceled at the rate of 20 percent for each year he teaches.

TITLE IV—WORK-STUDY PROGRAM

Grants totaling \$25 million for each of 6 years are authorized to be made to institutions of higher education on a dollar-for-dollar matching basis, to provide needy undergraduate students with jobs in the institutions. To the maximum extent practicable, the jobs will be in work relating to the courses being taken by the students. Preference will be given to students whose academic background indicates a superior capacity and preparation in science, mathematics, engineering, or modern foreign languages.

TITLE V—SCIENCE TEACHING FACILITIES

A. Assistance to State educational agencies

Grants totaling \$40 million are to be made annually for 6 years to State educational agencies for the acquisition of specialized equipment suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, or modern foreign languages, and for the minor alteration of teaching facilities used in connection with the above subjects. The Federal funds

would be matched on a dollar-for-dollar basis by State or local educational agencies.

B. Assistance to institutions of higher education

Grants totaling \$40 million are to be made annually for 6 years to institutions of higher education for the acquisition of specialized equipment suitable for use in providing undergraduate education in science, mathematics, engineering or modern foreign languages, and for the minor alteration of teaching facilities used in connection with the above subjects. The Federal funds would be matched on a dollar-for-dollar basis by institutions of higher education receiving Federal funds.

TITLE VI—SUMMER SCHOOL AND EXTENSION COURSES FOR TEACHERS

Grants totaling \$100 million for each of 6 years are authorized to assist public school elementary and secondary schoolteachers to improve their teaching ability and knowledge of the subjects they teach by taking advanced studies in summer sessions or extension courses offered by institutions of higher education. Teachers would be selected by the appropriate State educational agency and would receive stipends while attending advanced courses.

TITLE VII—NATIONAL DEFENSE FELLOWSHIPS

One thousand fellowships in the first year and 1,500 in each of the 5 succeeding years will be granted graduate students who are preparing to become teachers in colleges and universities. Fellowship stipends for living expenses are paid for 3 years on a rising scale, plus additional amounts for each dependent. An individual awarded a graduate fellowship is also paid amounts necessary to cover the cost of instruction, within certain limits, at the institution he is attending.

TITLE VIII—GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING

A. State programs

Grants of \$15 million for each of 6 years are made to State educational agencies to assist in establishing programs of guidance and counseling in secondary schools, to identify students with outstanding mental ability, advise them of courses of study, encourage them to complete secondary schooling, and to take the necessary courses for admission to college, and enter college after completing secondary schooling. After the second year of the program, States would be required to match the Federal funds on a dollar-for-dollar basis.

B. Institutes in guidance and counseling

For contract arrangements with institutions of higher education \$6 million is authorized for each of 6 years to provide for summer institute courses to secondary schoolteachers in the counseling and guidance of secondary school students, with particular emphasis on gifted students. Stipends are paid teachers attending these courses. Tuition and fees are also paid for by the Federal Government.

TITLE IX—SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE CONSULTANTS

Grants of \$10 million for each of 6 years are made to State educational agencies for programs to make available to science, mathematics, and language teachers in secondary schools information about advances in knowledge and current teaching methods, devices, and textbooks in their fields. After the second year of the program, States would be required to match the Federal funds on a dollar-for-dollar basis.

TITLE X—RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION IN MORE EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF TELEVISION, RADIO, MOTION PICTURES, AND RELATED MEDIA FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

An institute is created in the United States Office of Education for research and experimentation to develop and evaluate projects

involving television, radio, motion pictures, and other auditory and visual aids which may prove of value in State and local educational agencies and institutions of higher education. Grants-in-aid may be made to public or nonprofit private agencies or contracts may be made with such agencies for this research.

The Commissioner of Education will acquire motion pictures, kinescopes, video tapes, film strips, slides, recordings, magnetic tapes, radio and TV scripts, etc., for adaptation, to be made available upon request to State and local educational agencies.

For these programs, \$5 million is authorized for the first year and \$10 million for each of the succeeding 5 years.

TITLE XI—CONGRESSIONAL CITATIONS

Congressional citations for outstanding scholarship achievement are awarded annually to high-school graduates throughout the country who rank scholastically in the highest 5 percent of their graduating class.

TITLE XII—VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN OCCUPATIONS ESSENTIAL TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

An authorization of \$20 million a year is made available to the States to encourage the further promotion and development of area vocational education programs in occupations essential to national defense. The allocation of these funds guarantees immediate expansion of vocational training for technicians and needed skilled workers.

TITLE XIII—SCIENCE INFORMATION SERVICE

The National Science Foundation will establish a Science Information Service to provide for indexing, abstracting, translating, and disseminating scientific information, of both domestic and foreign origin, either by the Service itself or by grants or contracts with private organizations, professional associations, or Government agencies.

TITLE XIV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

This title contains a section establishing a National Advisory Council on Science and Education, provides for judicial review in certain instances of decisions of the Commissioner of Education, and in general contains various routine administrative provisions.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the table until the close of the session of the Senate on Monday next, to give an opportunity to any other Senators who may wish to do so to join in sponsoring the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am happy to associate myself with the National Defense Education Act of 1958. It is an honor to join my colleague the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] in this bill, which meets with bold and magnificent vision America's duty toward universal education.

While volume is not always a test of value, the completeness of Senator HILL's bill is proof of his thoroughness, his grasp of America's educational values, and his purpose that this Nation—first to advocate universal education as an opportunity for the individual—shall now be given new strength when it may well be a matter of national survival.

All of us—all of America—all of the free world—can be grateful for the research, the dedication and devotion, that has produced this result—this educational milestone in national concern acting through community control.

The measure has all the attributes of ideal education itself—universal, indi-

vidual, flexible, diversified, practicable, realizable, professional, and progressive.

I shall make no attempt to catalog the 12 areas in which schools and scholars, teachers and teaching facilities, will reach out to new horizons. For there is no Member of Congress, no newspaper or magazine, no educator, no public-spirited citizen who will not study this great work and take it to heart as a serious, sincere, and commonsense approach to the educational challenge of our people.

When only three-fourths of one penny out of every dollar of our national product is spent on higher education, when only 30 percent of our high-school graduates get to college, it is high time that we have a brave attack like this upon the problem. We can at least seek for quality if we cannot match the population of our most cruel competitor. We can no longer afford education as usual, for the times and the future are most unusual.

We can starve and stint our own education if we are foolhardy, but we can place no restraints on the full fling of education in lands where the aim is not for the opportunity of the student, but rather for the interest of the State.

And, believe me, the interests of such a State do not necessarily include the preservation of America. The preservation of America, her leadership and the obligations America has to freedom everywhere, is the goal of great thinkers like the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. Generations of freemen will rise to be grateful to him for his vision and dedication to American education and the welfare of its people.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I thank the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island for his most kind and exceedingly generous words. He and I were privileged to serve together on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It was a source of great regret to me that the demands of duty required him to relinquish his membership on that committee to go to another very important committee.

Surely it is a source of tremendous gratification, knowing the devotion and dedication of the Senator from Rhode Island to the cause of education, that in endeavoring to pass this legislation we shall have him with us, and have the benefit of his wisdom, his active help, and his tremendous driving power.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am deeply honored to join the great Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] in the co-sponsorship of his 6-year emergency national defense education program bill. As the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] has said, this is an excellent bill drafted by an exceedingly wise public servant. At the same time, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to join the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] in sponsoring the Education Act of 1957, S. 1134.

The Hill-Elliott bill primarily provides funds to improve higher education in America.

The Morse-Clark bill provides \$1 billion a year exclusively and entirely for primary and secondary education.

Mr. President, I am taking the unusual step of asking to be associated with this Morse-Clark bill, which was introduced last year, because the big education job that must be accomplished by the American people is in the grade schools and high schools of America. As a former State legislator in Wisconsin, and a three-time candidate for governor of my State, I am convinced that we cannot and will not provide the grade- and high-school system which America must have to survive if we continue to rely exclusively on local property taxes and State sales and income taxes. Wisconsin children are not getting an adequate education because local property taxes in my State simply cannot pay for the education they need and deserve.

The war of tomorrow will be won or prevented in the classrooms of today. That means in the grade school and high school, as well as university classrooms of today.

I respectfully suggest that the Hill-Elliott and Morse-Clark bills make a comprehensive package that will enable Congress to do the education job that must be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The junior Senator from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that his name be added as a cosponsor of a bill which has been introduced and already referred to committee. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to add to the statements made by several of my colleagues by saying that I am happy in joining today as a cosponsor of proposed legislation for a comprehensive program of Federal scholarships in higher educational levels, particularly in the realm of science, which is to be introduced soon by the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

All of us recognize the senior Senator from Alabama as one of those who have been preeminent and foremost in the introduction and sponsorship of educational legislation. I, myself, particularly honor him for his origination of the oil-for-education proposal, which would have used tideland oil receipts for the support of the schools in all the 48 States. I only regret that that forward-looking recommendation of the Senator from Alabama was not adopted.

However, I should like to join in the statement made earlier by the very distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER], in emphasizing the fact that in our concentration on higher education, we must not forget the elementary schools and the high schools of the Nation. I doubt very much if any program in the field of higher education will be successful unless we shore up the grade schools and high schools by providing additional financial support for them. We cannot erect a sound edifice on a weak foundation.

I daresay that the great scientists of our time, as well as of earlier times, such

as Einstein, Teller, Newton, Fermi, and many others, were not only products of academies and colleges and universities, and of the great scientific laboratories, but were products also of the elementary schools and high schools, and perhaps, even of kindergartens and nursery schools. Development of their talents began with their first entrance into any classroom.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, has labored long and effectively in drafting the National Defense Education Act of 1958. I consider it a privilege and an honor to be one of the group of Senators who have joined the Senator from Alabama as cosponsors of the bill.

I take this means of commending the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama for his resolute leadership in preparing a strong education bill. The measure just introduced provides not only for more scientific and technical training; it also places additional and much-needed emphasis on foreign languages and the humanities.

It is a broad, forward-looking, and imaginative program; it is an important step forward in meeting the critical needs of the times.

A million young Americans of college age are not in college because of financial inability to go. One-half of the top 30 percent, scholastically of high-school graduates never go to college a day because of financial adversity.

Our most precious resource is the human resource, and it is the most neglected and wasted of all. We dam our rivers, conserve our oil, and enrich our soil, but we let our youth go untrained.

Mr. President, America sleeps on the question of education. Courses that are easy to pass replace courses with an intellectual appeal. It is time that the emphasis in education be on education.

Included in the measure is a declaration of policy that States and local communities have and must retain the responsibility for and control of public education. Yet, in addition to the responsibilities of the States, the forward steps to be effected by the bill recognize the importance of those programs which are vital to national defense and which otherwise would be dangerously delayed due to inadequate financial resources.

I am honored to join with the distinguished chairman as a cosponsor of the bill.

PREVENTION OF DISCRIMINATION BECAUSE OF AGE OF WORKERS IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES AND GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the truly agonizing aspects of modern industrial life is the tendency to discard workers past the age of 40, or to refuse to hire men and women past this particular age. A great deal of suffering, humiliation and loss to our economy have been caused by this practice.

Discrimination based on age is, in my opinion, as reprehensible as discrimination which originates in racial or religious bigotry. Therefore, I am introduc-

ing legislation today to forbid "any supplier or contractor of our Government from imposing any requirement or limitation of maximum age with respect to the hiring or employment of persons."

The distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON] has emphasized the urgent need for additional defense contracts to produce missiles and other weapons. This means there will be more industries, manufacturers, and contractors supplying the Government than ever before. My bill would prevent these firms from discrimination against prospective or actual employees because of age.

The original suggestion for such legislation was made to me by an outstanding organization which has pioneered this cause for many years. I refer to the Fraternal Order of Eagles, of which I am pleased to be a member of long standing. Jobs Over 40 is the name of a crusade the Eagles have sponsored for a long period. Indeed, the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has prepared a very comprehensive bill to prevent discrimination in virtually all employment when that discrimination stems from age.

My proposed bill is far less sweeping or universal in its provisions than that contemplated by the Senator from New York. Therefore, it does not conflict in any way with his legislation but, rather, supplements and accompanies it. My bill would apply only to suppliers of the Government, and such firms already are subjected to special provisions with regard to hiring practices and other matters.

I desire to point out that I have communicated at length with Judge Robert W. Hansen, of Milwaukee, Wis., chairman of the national program of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, and he has indicated to me his general support of the bill I am introducing in the Senate today.

I am introducing this bill for myself and my colleagues, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. The title of this proposed legislation, I might add, is "A bill to prohibit discrimination because of age in the hiring and employment of persons by Government contractors."

Congress already has wisely enacted the Yates amendment, which forbids the imposition of age restrictions as a qualification for direct employment with the Federal Government. My bill would extend the Yates amendment, in essence, to Government contractors.

I ask that my bill appear in the Record, along with several brief articles on this vital question from the December 1957, number of the Eagle, which is the monthly magazine of the Fraternal Order of Eagles.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and articles will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3188) to prohibit discrimination because of age in the hiring and employment of persons by Government contractors, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, for himself and other Senators, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act entitled "An act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1936, as amended (41 U. S. C. 35-45), is amended (1) by striking out "and" following the semicolon in subsection (d), (2) by striking out the period at the end of subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and (3) by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(f) That the contractor will not expressly or in practice impose any requirement or limitation of maximum age with respect to the hiring or employment of persons, except such requirements or limitations, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor, relating to specific jobs or types of employment as are reasonably designed to protect older workers from tasks which they could not ordinarily because of their age be expected to perform safely or efficiently."

The articles presented by Mr. NEUBERGER are as follows:

[From the Eagle magazine of December 1957]
EAGLES GO ALL OUT IN OPPOSING DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT BASED ONLY ON AGE LIMITATIONS—JOBS AFTER 40 IS A MAJOR EAGLE CAMPAIGN

"Will You Be Through at 40?" was the provocative title of a recent article in the American Weekly. Following are excerpts of the article, proof—if we need any—of the importance of the Eagle Jobs-After-40 campaign, one of the most important on the Fraternal Order of Eagles schedule:

Losing their jobs through no fault of their own, 2 and 3 million men and women are finding themselves, in the prime of life, up against a stone wall of discrimination based solely upon their age.

More than half of all openings for salesmen are restricted to men under 35.

Over one-third of all job orders from banking, real-estate, transportation, communication, and public-utility companies specify 35 as the maximum hiring-age limit.

More than half of all job openings in factories and offices are today firmly closed to men of 45 and women over 40.

Hiring discrimination based upon age has not been diminishing. Instead, like a cancer, it has been growing from year to year.

In 1948, for instance the New York Legislative Committee on Problems of the Aging made a statewide check of employment practices. It found that 39 percent of all firms were consistently refusing jobs to men and women over 40. This spring the same committee held a new series of hearings and discovered that on Long Island the proportion of job orders that barred the over-40's had soared to a staggering 67.2 percent.

Congress passed the Yates amendment, prohibiting the imposition of age restrictions as a qualification for Federal employment. Thus, today, nearly a half million Federal job opportunities are being filled, every year, on the basis of ability and experience, irrespective of the birth date of the applicants.

In State and municipal government, scores of thousands of jobs are still being barred

to the middle-aged. A recent Labor Department survey found that more than a third of all local government positions specified 45 as the maximum hiring age and that 19 percent of all such jobs were restricted to men and women under 45.

Whether we need new laws—or far more extensive older worker counseling and placement programs—is still open to debate. Probably we need both. For age bias threatens an even larger number of us.

SENATOR NEUBERGER WILL AID "JOBS OVER 40" DRIVE

Eagle Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, a longtime member of Portland (Oreg.) Aerie No. 4, recently revealed that he plans to introduce in the next session of Congress legislation to forbid discrimination because of age in all jobs involving Federal defense contracts. Senator NEUBERGER voiced strong sentiments in favor of the Eagle "Jobs Over 40" program at last winter's Washington regional conference.

"As one who has long fought to preserve our Nation's natural resources, I surely intend to plunge into this fight to preserve our most valuable resource—our manpower," said Senator NEUBERGER. "Job discrimination based on age is depriving our Nation of a vast reservoir of skill and experience. We cannot long afford such a waste. Every study which has come to my attention indicates that older men can be just as valuable to employers as those who have not passed an arbitrary age barrier."

ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL SERIES OF STAMPS COMMEMORATING 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the University of Texas will this year observe the 75th anniversary of its formal opening.

Ceremonies marking the first day of life for the university took place on September 15, 1883. Establishment of the university was provided for by the Texas Constitution adopted in 1876.

Mr. President, during the last three-quarters of a century the University of Texas has grown into a great institution providing higher education for more than 17,000 students annually. It is an integral part of the life of my State, a source of pride to all Texans—who, I should add, are determined to continue year after year improving the already high quality of the education offered at the university.

It is fitting that the 75th anniversary of the founding of the University of Texas should be commemorated by the issuance by the Post Office Department of a special series of stamps. I am accordingly introducing a bill calling on the Postmaster General to take action to issue such a series. I am hopeful that he will act speedily so that the Federal Government may participate in the celebration of this significant event.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3190) to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorating the 75th anniversary of the founding of the University of Texas, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

VINCENT R. GONZALES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Vincent R. Gonzales. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3193) for the relief of Vincent R. Gonzales, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the act entitled "An act providing for the barring of claims against the United States," approved October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1061), the Comptroller General of the United States shall (1) receive and consider any claim filed, within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, by Vincent R. Gonzales, of Portland, Oreg., for travel expenses incurred by him while employed as an auditor for the Public Housing Administration during the period November 3, 1946, through March 31, 1947, and (2) certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount, if any, determined to be owing on such claim. Any amount so certified shall be paid to Vincent R. Gonzales by the Secretary of the Treasury out of any funds not otherwise appropriated.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILLS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] be added as a cosponsor of Senate bill 3097, the Labor Reports Act of 1958; Senate bill 3098, to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, as amended; and Senate bill 3099, to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PROGRAMS UNDER DOMESTIC TUNGSTEN, ASBESTOS, FLUORSPAR, AND COLUMBIUM-TANTALUM PRODUCTION AND PURCHASE ACT OF 1956—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 29, 1958,

The names of Senators ALLOTT, BENNETT, CARROLL, GOLDWATER, HAYDEN, MURRAY, WATKINS, and MANSFIELD were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3186) to extend for 1 year certain programs established under the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN on January 29, 1958.

BRUCellosis CONTROL—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, yesterday the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER] introduced Senate bill 3183, which deals with the great brucellosis threat which confronts some of the

cattle herds of the United States and which, through them, endangers the health of many of our people, because brucellosis, as medical science points out, is a cause of undulant fever, that has such a devastating effect on the health of too many Americans. I should be very much pleased to return to the junior Senator from Wisconsin the expression of confidence which he expressed in the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and me this morning, when he asked to join as a sponsor of our education bill. I have already spoken to the Senator from Wisconsin about this, and I ask unanimous consent to be a cosponsor of the Proxmire brucellosis bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That Mr. CARROLL be, and he is hereby, excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Public Works and assigned to service on the Committee on the Judiciary.

That Mr. YARBOROUGH be, and he is hereby, assigned to service on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

Address on the subject America in Crisis, delivered by Senator JAVITS before the Commonwealth Club of California, in San Francisco, January 17, 1958.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Clark W. Gregory, of Michigan, to be United States marshal, eastern district of Michigan.

Edward L. McCarthy, of Rhode Island, to be United States marshal for the district of Rhode Island.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Thursday, February 6, 1958, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

ANALYSES OF THE LABOR REPORTS ACT OF 1958 AND BILLS AMENDING THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on January 23, 1958, I introduced three bills which would carry out the proposals made in the President's

labor message of the same date. These bills are S. 3097, the Labor Reports Act of 1958; and S. 3098 and S. 3099, which would amend the Taft-Hartley Act in several respects.

At the time of the introduction of these bills, we did not have the analysis of them which usually accompanies such proposed legislation. Inasmuch as I have now received these detailed explanations, section by section, of the bills, I feel it appropriate that they be inserted in the RECORD at this time. In light of the importance of this proposed legislation and our desire to consider it at the earliest possible opportunity, I feel that the explanatory statements should be before the entire Senate, for study before the hearings begin.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that these full statements, prepared by the Department of Labor, be printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF A BILL FOR THE ENACTMENT OF THE LABOR REPORTS ACT OF 1958

This bill would carry out the recommendations of President Eisenhower for legislation to provide greater protections for the rights of individual workers and the public in the administration of labor organization affairs.

As recommended by the President, the bill would:

1. Provide for reporting to the Department of Labor on an annual basis of those financial affairs and transactions of labor organizations which should be managed and conducted in the interests of the workers represented by such organizations;

2. Provide for reporting to the Department of Labor on an annual basis of information as to the constitutions, bylaws, and organizational structure and procedures of labor organizations which govern the rights and obligations of their members;

3. Provide for appropriate annual reporting to show that labor organizations select their officers through secret vote of the members on due notice and not less often than once in every 4 years;

4. Require labor organizations to keep proper records on the matters of which reports are required, which are open to the scrutiny of all of their members;

5. Provide for appropriate disclosure of the information reported by labor organizations and insure that the public interest in carrying out the objectives of such organizations in representing workers is protected by opening the reports to public scrutiny;

6. Require all financial transactions between labor and management representatives which may reflect conflicts of interests in labor-management relations to be reported by labor organizations, their agents and representatives, and employers;

7. Confirm by Federal law the fiduciary responsibilities of persons entrusted with the funds of labor organizations and provide for the enforcement of these responsibilities through representative suits in the Federal or State courts;

8. Provide in the Department of Labor a Commissioner of Labor Reports to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who will be available to the Secretary of Labor for the performance of functions given him by this legislation and by related legislation for reporting and disclosure of employee welfare and pension plan information;

9. Provide the authority necessary for effective administration of the program, in-

cluding authority to investigate violations, subpoena witnesses, hold hearings, and compel testimony and the production of books and records;

10. Authorize actions for injunctions against violations.

11. Provide administrative procedures for withdrawing, in a proper case and subject to judicial review, certain rights and privileges where violations amount to a willful failure to file a true and proper report. Rights and privileges which could be withdrawn for an appropriate period or periods include:

(a) Recognition or certification pursuant to Federal laws of a labor organization as the representative of employees;

(b) Access to procedures of Federal agencies such as the National Labor Relations Board which exercise decisional functions in labor-management relations matters;

(c) Tax exemptions provided for labor organizations by the Internal Revenue Code.

12. Prescribe criminal penalties for willful violations and other wrongdoing, including:

(a) False filing (False Information Act made applicable);

(b) Embezzlement of union funds;

(c) False entries and wrongful destruction of union books and records;

(d) Bribery by union or employer representatives in matters affecting labor-management relations.

Through its reporting and disclosure provisions, the bill would open to scrutiny of the interested union members and the public those areas in which malfeasance and misfeasance by those entrusted with union affairs could otherwise go on undetected with the protection of a cloak of secrecy. Irregularities and abuses of the kinds reported in recent investigations can be largely eliminated, without the necessity of direct governmental regulation of union affairs, by the provisions of this bill which would bring into the open the acts and transactions of a financial or procedural nature in which breaches of trust could occur. The fact that these acts and transactions would be subject to scrutiny would deter wrongdoing, and if it nevertheless occurred, the bill's provisions would enable union members to enforce fiduciary responsibilities for union funds and would authorize criminal prosecutions for willful acts in disregard of these responsibilities. Appropriate provision for administrative action and for injunctions against violations of the law's requirements would further aid the effectiveness of the reporting and disclosure program.

A summary discussion of the bill by title and section follows:

Section 1 of the bill provides a short title for the legislation, the Labor Reports Act of 1958.

Section 2 of the bill consists of the Congressional findings and policy showing the relationship of its subject matter to the free flow of commerce, the revenue of the United States, and the general welfare.

TITLE I—REPORTING AND DISCLOSURES Applicability to labor organizations

Section 101: This section makes the act applicable to every labor organization engaged in activities affecting commerce or affording a basis for exemption from taxation under provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. This includes local, national, and international unions as well as local, State, and regional conferences and councils.

Obligations of Labor Organizations

Section 102: Section 102 requires each labor organization to file annually with the Secretary of Labor, in the form and manner which the Secretary of Labor shall prescribe by regulations, certain reports and other documents concerning its organization, procedures, and financial affairs and make copies of these reports available to each of its

members. The reports required to be filed include copies by each organization of its constitution and bylaws together with reports showing details of its procedures with respect to such things as requirements and qualifications for and restrictions on membership meetings and elections, selection of certain officers and agents, levying of assessments, imposition of fines, authorization for disbursement of union funds, audit of union financial transactions, expulsion of members, and procedure with respect to authorization for bargaining demands and strike authorization.

A report concerning its financial affairs must also be filed annually by each organization showing, among other things, the assets and liabilities of the organization at the close of its last fiscal year and its financial activities during the year. In addition, the reports must contain a detailed explanation of the receipt by its officers or representatives of any thing of value from certain employers, except transactions permitted by section 302 (c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended. In accordance with the regulations issued by the Secretary, the organization must retain the basic records on the matters required to be reported for not less than 3 years for inspection by the Secretary or members of the organization. At the time of filing, the union must certify that not less than once every 4 years the members in good standing are permitted, after due notice, to elect their local officers directly by secret ballot and to elect their national officers in the same manner or through representatives to delegate bodies elected directly by secret ballot.

Reports of Labor-Management Financial Dealings

Section 103: This section requires any officer or other representative of a labor organization who receives or gives anything of value either directly or indirectly from or to certain employers to make a contemporaneous record of the transaction and file a detailed report with the Secretary. Similar records and reports must also be made and filed by the employer concerned. No report is necessary, however, for transactions permitted by section 302 (c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended.

Disclosure of Reported Information

Section 104: Section 104 permits the Secretary to disclose publicly the information received under sections 102 and 103 and to use the information for such studies and reports as he deems appropriate. Any person may inspect the material, and copies of any report or document may be obtained upon payment of a charge based on the cost of the service. The Secretary may make available or require a labor organization or employer to furnish a State agency copies of any reports in that State if requested by the Governor.

TITLE II—FUNDS AND PROPERTY OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

Fiduciary Responsibilities

Section 201: Section 201 places any officer or other representative of a labor organization in a position of trust with respect to any money or other property in his possession by virtue of his position and makes him responsible for it in a fiduciary capacity.

Judicial Enforcement

Section 202: This section provides that union members may bring a class action in any court of competent jurisdiction for appropriate relief because of any act or omission of an official in disregard of any right or responsibility under section 201.

Section 203: Section 203 gives Federal district courts jurisdiction of actions under section 202.

Effect on State Laws

Section 204: Section 204 makes it clear that this title in no way reduces or limits

the responsibilities of union officials under State law or bars any remedy of union members under State law.

TITLE III—ADMINISTRATION, ENFORCEMENT, AND PENALTIES

General administration

Section 301: The Secretary is authorized under this section to administer the act and to prescribe such procedures, make such expenditures, and hire such personnel as will be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

Section 302: This section provides for the appointment by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate of a Commissioner of Labor Reports who will carry out the functions delegated to him by the Secretary under this or any other law.

Investigations, Administrative Proceedings and Injunctions

Section 303: Section 303 authorizes the Secretary to investigate the accuracy, completeness and truth or falsity of information reported under the act. He also has authority under this section to investigate whether any person has violated the act and to investigate any other matter necessary to carry out the provisions of the act. For the purposes of these investigations, the Secretary has the authority to hold hearings, make findings of fact and decisions and necessary authority relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production and inspection of papers and documents.

Section 304: Section 304 requires the Secretary to provide for administrative proceedings in accordance with the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act with respect to adjudication on notice and hearing in determining whether any labor organization or employer has willfully failed or refused to file a true and proper report or other document as required by title I. If it is determined that a party to the proceedings has willfully so violated the act an order will be issued imposing for an appropriate period such of the following sanctions as may be determined necessary to carry out the purposes of this act:

In the case of a labor organization, it could be ineligible (a) to obtain or retain a certification or other recognition under Federal law as the representative of any employees. (However, nothing in this provision will affect an organization's rights to utilize the services of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, or prohibit the Service from providing its services in situations in which such an organization is involved); (b) to have access to procedures of Federal agencies which exercise decisional functions in labor-management relations matters such as the National Labor Relations Board; and (c) to have an exemption from income taxes under the Internal Revenue Code.

In the case of an employer's violation, he could be ineligible to have access to procedures of Federal agencies which exercise decisional functions in labor-management relations matters such as the National Labor Relations Board.

Upon receipt of notice from the Secretary that a proceeding has been brought, any Federal agency which may be required to act or omit to act in accordance with a decision or order issued in the proceeding may hold in abeyance any matter or proceeding which may be affected by the decision or order until such decision or order has been made.

Decisions and orders made under this section are subject to judicial review as provided in the Administrative Procedure Act.

Section 305: This section authorizes legal actions to be brought in the name of the Secretary in Federal district courts to restrain violations, compel the disclosure of information required to be filed, or enforce any duty created by this act.

Cooperation With Other Agencies

Section 306: In order to avoid unnecessary expense and duplication, this section provides for full cooperation, including working arrangements and the exchange of information, between Federal, State, and local agencies. All evidence warranting consideration for criminal prosecution shall be turned over to the Attorney General for appropriate action.

Penalties

Section 307: Criminal penalties are provided for willful violation or failure to comply with the provisions of title I and for the filing of false information in any report required under sections 102 and 103.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Definitions

Section 401: This section defines nine terms used throughout the act including "labor organization," "employer," "employee," "person," "commerce," and "affecting commerce."

Effect of Other Laws

Section 402: This act does not exempt or relieve any person from any other Federal or State law not in direct conflict with it.

Statutory Provisions Amended or Repealed

Section 403: This section amends the National Labor Relations Act so that no labor organization can be eligible for certification or avail itself of the processes of the Board unless it and any national or international labor organization of which it is an affiliate can show that it has filed, and made available to its members the information required by this act. This section also repeals section 9 (g) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, which requires a limited form of union reporting.

Section 404: This section contains a separability provision.

TITLE V—AMENDMENTS TO THE CRIMINAL CODE

Section 501: Section 501 amends title 18 of the United States Code to make it a felony for any person having any direct or indirect functions in connection with the money or other property of a labor organization subject to the provisions of this bill to embezzle, steal, or unlawfully take or convert any of the assets of the organization. It would also be a felony for any such person to make a false entry in any of the documents required to be kept by law with intent to injure or defraud the organization or its members, or to destroy any of this material without authority. A violation is punishable by a fine of not more than \$5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

Section 502: Section 502 makes it a felony for any representative of employees who are employed in any industry affecting commerce, as well as any officer or other representative of a union the members of which are so employed, and any employer or his representative to offer, solicit, or accept bribes from or to each other for the purpose of influencing decisions or actions in labor-management relations matters. A violation is punishable by a fine of not more than 3 times the amount involved or imprisonment for not more than 3 years, or both. Immunity from prosecution is granted any person required to present self-incriminating testimony or evidence before a grand jury or court of the United States in a case or proceeding under this section if he is compelled to testify or produce such evidence after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination.

EXPLANATION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947, AS AMENDED, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

This bill would make two changes in the Labor Management Relations Act. One relates only to employers and employees in

the building and construction industry; the other is of general application but is of particular interest to the building and construction industry. Both of these proposals are in accord with the advice of a committee composed of representatives of employers and employees in the building and construction industry, which had extensive consultations with the Department of Labor with respect to amendment of the act as it relates to that industry.

CERTIFICATION WITHOUT ELECTION

This draft bill would amend the National Labor Relations Act (title I of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947) so as to authorize the National Labor Relations Board, under appropriate circumstances, to certify unions acting in behalf of employees of employers primarily engaged in the building and construction industry as exclusive bargaining representatives of such employees without a prior election. This proposal would require a joint petition by the employer and union involved asserting present recognition of the union by the employer as the bargaining representative of his employees and the existence of a collective bargaining agreement between them. No certification would be made under this amendment if there was no history of collective bargaining relationship between the union and the employer prior to the current agreement or if there was an allegation, and the Board found, that a substantial number of the employees in the unit in question asserted that the union was not designated or selected as bargaining agent by a majority of such employees.

It has long been recognized that the hiring practices and collective bargaining relationships in the construction industry are unlike those in manufacturing and in other service industries and are difficult to accommodate under the representation procedures of the National Labor Relations Act. These procedures were designed to deal with employment relationships which are of some permanence and they have proved ineffective where, as in the construction industry, the employment is casual and intermittent and the employee may be employed by several employers within a short period of time. Proposals have been made from time to time to amend the act so as to enable the construction industry's labor relations to come into conformity with the representation provisions of the act.

The present proposal provides a means whereby construction unions may acquire Board certification as exclusive bargaining representatives. There are several advantages accruing to a union as the result of Board certification. Conversely there are disadvantages resulting from lack of certification—disadvantages which construction unions have suffered only because the employment patterns in their industry made certification impossible under the existing provisions of the act.

The effect of this proposal would be to protect voluntary collective bargaining relationships established in good faith without governmental intervention. The proposal protects the right of the employees to be free of coercion in the selection of their own bargaining representatives; the will of the employees in this respect would be required to be evidenced by a history of prior collective bargaining between the union and the employer and by an absence of substantial objection on the part of the employees in the bargaining unit to certification of the union.

APPRENTICESHIP AND TRAINING TRUST FUNDS

The draft bill would amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, so as to clarify the legality, under section 302 of the act, of employer contributions to jointly administered apprenticeship and training trust funds.

Section 302 makes it unlawful for an employer to pay or deliver to a representative of his employees any money or other thing of value and for such representative to receive or accept from the employer any money or other thing of value with certain enumerated exceptions. Payments to a trust fund set up to finance an apprenticeship or training program are not among these exceptions and it is the purpose of this amendment to specifically except such payments from the application of section 302.

This proposal would apply to all such apprenticeship and training trust funds but it is of particular importance to the building and construction industry in which such trust funds are numerous. Because of the unique employment relationships and hiring practices in the construction industry training is considered as a joint responsibility of the employer and employee representatives and in most instances is financed by contributions to a jointly administered trust fund.

Pursuant to statutory direction "to bring together employers and labor for the formulation of programs of apprenticeship," the Department of Labor, through its Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, has developed joint national training programs in most of the major trades. These programs call for the organization of joint employer-labor committees which are responsible for carrying out training programs at the local employment level. In the construction industry apprentices are indentured to these joint committees. The proper carrying out of the training functions of the committee requires funds for the payment of salaries of instructors and other costs of administration and instruction. These funds are provided in many instances by employer contributions to trust funds which are administered by the joint training committee.

This proposal would provide that these funds be excepted from section 302 provided that they conform with certain of the standards made applicable by that section to health and welfare funds. These include requirements that (1) the basis on which payments to the fund are to be made be set out in a written agreement between the employer and the representative of the employees, (2) employers and employees be equally represented in the administration of the fund, (3) provision be made for the breaking of any deadlock between employer and employee representatives by a neutral person, and (4) there be an annual audit of the fund which shall be available to all interested persons.

EXPLANATION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947, AS AMENDED, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

This bill would carry out the recommendations of the President that inequities and ambiguities in certain provisions of the National Labor Relations Act and the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, be removed by appropriate amendment of these acts.

As recommended by the President, the bill would:

1. Amend the secondary boycott provisions of the National Labor Relations Act so that they are made applicable to certain secondary activities not presently covered and to make it clear that they do not apply in situations where the secondary employer is not a truly neutral bystander;

2. Amend the National Labor Relations Act to make it an unfair labor practice, subject to the mandatory injunction provision, for a union to engage in coercive picketing to force an employer to recognize it as the bargaining representative of his employees or to force the employees to accept it as their bargaining representative where it is clear that the employees do not desire the union;

3. Amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to eliminate the statutory prohibition against replaced economic strikers voting in representation elections;

4. Amend the Labor-Management Relations Act so as to extend the present prohibition against employer payments to employee representatives to certain payments and situations not presently covered;

5. Amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to authorize State agencies and courts to act with respect to matters over which the National Labor Relations Board declines to assert jurisdiction;

6. Amend the National Labor Relations Act to eliminate the requirement that union officers file non-Communist affidavits;

7. Amend the National Labor Relations Act so that bargaining during the term of a collective bargaining agreement may not be required;

8. Amend the National Labor Relations Act to permit the President to designate an acting general counsel when that office becomes vacant.

In the 10 or more years since the enactment of the amendments to the National Labor Relations Act provided by the Taft-Hartley Act, court and board decisions have revealed in a number of instances that the secondary boycott provisions do not provide protections against certain secondary activities which are as much against the public interest as those considered covered by the act. This bill is intended to apply the secondary-boycott provisions to these situations.

At present if a union, in order to force a secondary employer to cease doing business with another person, threatens the employer with a strike or a refusal of his employees to perform services it is not an unfair labor practice. Threats of strikes are more numerous than actual strikes and they often are as effective in persuading the employer to the union's object. Permitting such pressures to be exerted against neutral employers, therefore, provides a means of evading the purpose of the secondary-boycott provisions. The bill is designed to correct this by making the provisions applicable to efforts to threaten, coerce, or restrain employers.

Another manner in which the present provisions have proved inadequate is in their failure to apply to the inducement of employees of railroads, agricultural employees, and public bodies to refuse to perform services in order to force their employers to stop doing business with a primary employer. This is based on the fact that these employers and their employees do not come within the act's definitions of those terms. The bill proposes to cure this by changing, where necessary, references in the secondary-boycott provisions to "employees" and "employers" to "individuals" and "persons," which have sufficiently broad meanings to bring, as they should be, these neutral employers and employees within the coverage of the protections of the act against secondary activities.

A third form of secondary activity which has been held not violative of the secondary boycott provisions is when the pressure against an employer to cease doing business with another is directed at him through the inducement of his employees individually to refuse to perform services. The cumulative effect of such individual refusals is no less effective than a concerted refusal to perform services. The bill would deal with such situations by referring to "any individual" as distinguished from "employees" and removing the reference to "a concerted refusal" to perform services.

On the other hand, there are situations in which an employer who is not a truly neutral secondary employer may undeservedly receive the protections intended for innocent third parties to labor disputes. The employee who performs for another em-

ployer, whose employees are on strike, work which the striking employees would normally perform is an ally of the primary employer and should not be protected from retaliatory union activity for doing so. The bill, accordingly, contains a proviso which, under certain circumstances, would make the secondary boycott provisions inapplicable to activity directed against an employer performing "farmed out" work in behalf of a struck employer.

The bill also would permit activities otherwise prohibited by the secondary boycott provisions where the secondary employer is engaged together in work on the same construction site with the primary employer. Here again the secondary employer is not in a strictly neutral relationship with the other employers with whom he is engaged in a single construction project. Where there is a lawful dispute on such a site with respect to working conditions there, this bill would permit the union involved in the dispute to extend its pressures to any or all of the other employers working on the same site.

While the bill does not deal specifically with "hot cargo" agreements the total effect of its amendments to the secondary boycott provisions, particularly the one directed against direct coercion of employers, is to prohibit attempts to force an employer into entering into or to perform such an agreement.

The bill would also amend the National Labor Relations Act so as, for the first time, to deal specifically with organizational and recognition picketing. Such picketing has been generally criticized and there are many who would prohibit it completely. The bill would not do this but it would restrict picketing to force organization or recognition to situations where the employees in question have evidenced sufficient interest in having the union as their bargaining representative and even then would permit it only for a reasonable period of time within which a representation election would have to be conducted.

The proposal would prohibit this type of picketing, unless the union could show a sufficient interest on the part of the employees to have the union represent them. It would prohibit it after a union has picketed for a reasonable period and a representation election has not been conducted in that time. It would prohibit it if within the preceding year a representation election was conducted and another union or no union received the support of a majority of the employees. It would prohibit such picketing where the employer is already lawfully recognizing another union.

The bill recognizes that the usual remedies of the act, as in the case of secondary boycotts, are inadequate in the case of this type of picketing. To be effective, a remedy must provide speedy relief by an immediate termination of the picketing. The bill, therefore, would make violation of the provision subject to the mandatory injunction provided in section 10 (1) of the National Labor Relations Act.

Ever since the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act, the provision which bars strikers who are not entitled to reinstatement from voting in representation elections has been referred to as a "union-busting" device. It is claimed that under appropriate economic conditions, this provision, used together with certain other provisions, could destroy a union.

The bill would delete this provision of the act and leave the question of the voting eligibility of these persons to the administrative discretion of the Board, which presently has authority to determine other questions of eligibility, timing, and other matters relating to the conduct of elections. The Board, it is assumed, would decide this issue with due regard for the equities involved.

The recent decisions of the Supreme Court in the Guss and related cases have confirmed the belief that there is a serious gap with respect to jurisdiction over labor disputes with respect to which the National Labor Relations Board, in its discretion, has refused to assert jurisdiction. The courts have ruled that the States cannot act in these cases and as a result the injured parties are left with no forum in which to seek relief.

This bill is designed to close the gap by permitting State agencies and courts to act where the Board by rule or otherwise has declined to assert jurisdiction. This would mean that if the Board has declined by decision in the particular case, or by administrative rule or regulation has promulgated a jurisdictional standard which would exclude such a case, the State courts and agencies may act.

Section 302 of the Labor Management Relations Act makes unlawful payments of money or other things of value by an employer to a representative of his employees. Experience has indicated that the section does not completely cover the area of improper employer payments to employee representatives. The bill would amend the section to make it specifically apply to payments made to employee representatives by employer agents or representatives. It would also be made applicable to payments made by an employer to representatives of any employees, as distinguished from his employees, employed in an industry affecting commerce, so long as the payment is made to the representative in his capacity as a representative. Receipt of such payments by a representative is also unlawful.

There has been evidence of employers, or employer representatives, making payments to employees of the employer for the purpose of having those employees influence or interfere with the rights of other employees of the employer to organize and to engage in concerted activities as guaranteed by section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act. The bill would amend section 302 so as to make such payments unlawful.

Another amendment to section 302 contained in the bill would make it clear that among the employer payments excepted from the applicability of the section are contributions to jointly administered apprenticeship and training trust funds meeting certain appropriate standards.

Other provisions of the bill would:

(a) Eliminate the present requirement that each officer of a union seeking to use the processes of the act file an affidavit that he is not a member of, or affiliated with, the Communist Party or a believer in, or member or supporter of, any organization which believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the Government by force or illegal or unconstitutional means. There is now in effect the Communist Control Act of 1954 which is specifically directed against Communist-infiltrated labor organizations.

(b) Make it clear that the act does not require a party to a valid collective bargaining contract to bargain during the life of the contract with respect to any modification which would become effective before a reopening is permitted by the terms of the contract. The parties, of course, could agree to a reopening at any time. Any possibility that one party to a valid contract may compel it to be reopened to change during its life defeats the stability in labor relations which the act was designed to achieve.

(c) Would permit the President to designate an acting General Counsel during vacancies in that office. The act provides that the General Counsel shall have final authority in certain matters, including the issuance of unfair labor practice complaints. It is not clear that this authority can be exercised by any person who has not been properly appointed to that office. Unless an act-

ing General Counsel can be designated, a long vacancy of this office could be very disruptive of the administration of the act.

The amendments made by the bill would become effective 60 days after its enactment and the bill contains a savings clause to prevent their being applied to acts performed prior to its enactment.

EXCHANGES BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, this is the first opportunity I have had to comment on the significant agreement on exchanges between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Ambassador Lacy is to be commended highly for the diplomatic skill he has shown in the 3 months of negotiations which led up to this agreement. His success is a demonstration to all the world that our Government is determined to carry out President Eisenhower's pledge, in his state of the Union message, regarding "works of peace."

When the news of the agreement was announced on Monday, I was absent, by leave of the Senate; I addressed the New Jersey Farm Bureau, in Trenton, at which time, coincidentally, I stressed the need for just such an exchange of scientific, cultural, technical, and educational personnel. The theme of my speech was that, while we must diligently maintain our military and scientific position, our only real hope for lasting peace lies in strengthening the foundations of mutual understanding between the peoples of Russia and those of the free world. This agreement on exchanges is an important step toward the establishment of this sort of international confidence.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of Wednesday, January 29. The article was written by Roscoe Drummond, and is entitled "United States-Soviet Exchange Pact Is Said To Help Both Sides."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES-SOVIET EXCHANGE PACT IS SAID TO HELP BOTH SIDES

WASHINGTON.—Don't breathe on it because it might go away. But if you will tiptoe up here's something to look at:

The United States and the Soviet Union have reached an agreement. It is a significant agreement.

It is not going to end the cold war, but it bears on its conduct.

It has taken 2½ years to bring it off, but it is now done, signed and sealed.

The agreement itself will set in motion a wide-ranging exchange of contacts—both people and ideas—between the United States of America and the U. S. S. R.

To bring about a wider contact among our peoples, arrangements are being made to exchange some 40 delegations of persons in industry, agriculture, the sciences, teachers, writers, composers, singers, dancers, actors, and symphony orchestras.

To bring about a wider exchange of ideas, arrangements are being made for a series of Soviet radio and TV programs to be heard in the United States with comparable time on the Soviet radio and TV available for American programs.

Is all this just peanuts? Or is it important and meaningful in the whole range of lacerated United States-Soviet relations? I think it is an exceedingly important piece of East-West business for three reasons:

1. This exchange issue was one of the half-dozen topics which occupied the summit conference at Geneva. Something is now being done about it. Any evenly measured agreement with Moscow is useful. One little agreement could lead to another. It could be moderately habit forming.

2. It should be frankly recognized—and this, it seems to me, is what makes the agreement exceptionally significant—that in the radio and TV exchange, the Soviets are making a harder and, in reality, a greater concession to us than we are making to them. In permitting any American programs on the Soviet radio and TV networks, Moscow is giving up a degree of its nearly total censorship over the minds of its people. We, in return, are only called upon to practice more of the freedom of speech and inquiry which we prize so highly. Thus the Soviets are doing something un-Soviet, since they are letting a little free air into their closed society, while we are doing what is characteristic of democracy, that is, practicing freedom.

3. The agreement may help lay the groundwork for further agreement. We shouldn't expect very much very soon. But it can't fail to be helpful in the long view for more Russians and more Americans to know each other's country better. This is the kind of exchange which we should welcome and in which both sides will win.

The patience and skill of the head of the State Department's Office of East-West Contacts, Ambassador William Lacy, helped to make the negotiations successful. He tried all along to get Moscow to include an exchange of commentaries on world events as part of the mutual radio and TV programs. So far, the Soviets have demurred at permitting the broadcasts to be as political and as controversial as such commentaries would inevitably become.

The agreed subjects for the radio and TV exchange are limited to science, techniques, sports, industry, agriculture, education, and health. This is a good beginning. They provide opportunity to give to Soviet listeners and viewers a picture of how life is lived in America and how a free society works.

These broadcasts ought not to be pugnacious or truculent. They ought to be candid and descriptive and convey all they can of the heart and spirit of the people. I would hope that the time might come when the Kremlin would let the Soviet people hear an American commentary on world events—and we theirs; these commentaries need not be combative, just straightforward and honest.

It was in the summer of 1955 that Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Bulganin said they would like to do this. It is now being done. That's something. It may prove to be more than something.

AN APPRECIATION OF MR. JUSTICE FRANKFURTER

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may be permitted to address the Senate for not to exceed 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Ohio may proceed.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, today Mr. Justice Frankfurter begins his 20th year of service on the Supreme Court of the United States. On November 15, 1957, he celebrated his 75th birthday. At this time I should like to express briefly,

and hence inadequately, my admiration for his work.

My remarks are inspired, not so much by the amenities appropriate to these occasions, as by a widespread popular misconception about Mr. Justice Frankfurter's judicial philosophy. My salute to the Justice must necessarily be impersonal, but for that reason it may more effectively dispel misunderstanding about his record.

There have been introduced in the Congress several bills to require prior judicial service as a condition to appointment to the Supreme Court. The mere fact that such legislation would have disqualified Mr. Frankfurter is sufficient reason for not passing it.

It is hardly necessary for me to say that I do not agree with all the opinions written by Mr. Justice Frankfurter, lucid and persuasive though they are. However, it is worth saying that frequency of agreement with a particular Justice is not a valid measure of his worth.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter's position on the political arc is, of course, to the left of mine. If he were a United States Senator from Massachusetts, no doubt we would often find ourselves in honest disagreement—although not so often, I think, as some might imagine. Perhaps it is this difference in political philosophy which has made me aware of his profound understanding of the judicial function.

Within my memory no member of the Supreme Court has been more successful in keeping purely personal preferences from shaping his constitutional and statutory interpretations. As the Justice said in his address at Cambridge, Mass., in September 1955, when commemorating the 200th anniversary of the birth of Chief Justice Marshall:

If judges want to be preachers, they should dedicate themselves to the pulpit; if judges want to be primary shapers of policy, the legislature is their place. Self-willed judges are the least defensible offenders against government under law.

Over the past 20 years I have not had the time to read more than a small percentage of the opinions of the Supreme Court. But I think I have read enough of the cases to say with some authority that no one on the bench in that period has shown a better understanding of the need for judicial self-restraint than has Mr. Justice Frankfurter. This understanding is reflected in scores of opinions showing an honest search for Congressional intent, a decent respect for State legislatures and State judiciaries, and an aversion to the adjudication of issues which are prematurely raised, basically trivial, or essentially political in character. It is tempting to recite cases illustrating the Justice's keen sense of judicial self-restraint, but the selection would probably be more indicative of my thinking than of his.

What is most important about Mr. Justice Frankfurter's work, I think, is that he never spares himself the intellectual effort required to decide a case upon principle—that is, in accordance with a coherent and consistent idea of justice, illuminated, as it must be, by history, by judicial precedent, and by

circumstances, new and old. This is vitally important. The Supreme Court is a powerful check on democratic processes. The judicial check will not be tolerated unless it can be justified as a necessary purification and refinement of the will of the people, and this cannot be done unless the judicial process reflects a set of impersonal and objective values.

The issues presented to the Supreme Court are not to be solved on a slide rule. Such an attempt is often made, and the Court is discredited in direct proportion to the frequency of the effort. Many types of slide rules have been employed. For some Justices, it is their own economic and social philosophy; for some, the slide rule is a blind obedience to precedent; for others, it calculates the middle of the road between two polar positions; and for still others the mechanical aid determines, on a purely sentimental basis, the disposition of the case at hand without regard to its future consequences.

Lambert against California, decided December 16, 1957, is a relatively unimportant case. Its recent date makes it a most fitting example of Mr. Justice Frankfurter's long fight against the substitution of mechanical formulas for value judgments. The Court held that punishment under a California law requiring convicted felons to register with the police offended due process unless the convicted felon had actual knowledge of the requirement and failed to register. In his dissenting opinion Mr. Justice Frankfurter said:

What is this but a return to yearbook distinctions between feaseance and non-feaseance—a distinction that may have significance in the evolution of commonlaw notions of liability, but is inadmissible as a line between constitutionality and unconstitutionality.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter did not cite the thousands of Federal and State laws which would be nullified if the Lambert case were to be followed, because, as he put it:

I feel confident that the present decision will turn out to be . . . a derelict on the waters of the law.

So it will, and so in time will many other decisions from which he dissented.

I shall conclude, Mr. President, simply by expressing the hope that we may have on the Supreme Court for many years to come the brilliant light and the penetrating vision of Mr. Justice Felix Frankfurter.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM H. PUTNAM, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, tonight in Hartford, Conn., many of his friends and admirers will gather at the Hotel Statler-Hilton to pay tribute to one of Connecticut's most outstanding citizens, William H. Putnam.

Mr. Putnam has served the people of his community and his State in many worthwhile civic, public, and private endeavors.

His most recent accomplishment was his leadership in conceiving and directing the erection of a series of bridges over the Connecticut River, which have

opened new means of accessibility to and for the Greater Hartford area.

This concept was bold and challenging. His vision and his drive stimulated a spirit which spelled success. Mr. Putnam, in this project and in many other endeavors with which he has been associated, displayed leadership of the highest order.

The final measurement, the ultimate estimate of a community or any other political subdivision, large or small, is and must be based on the contributions of its citizens made to the overall good.

Mr. President, we are most fortunate indeed to have men of the stature and good will of William H. Putnam in Connecticut. To him and to them must go much of the credit for the leadership which our State has given to this Nation since its earliest days.

As impressive as the new bridges spanning the Connecticut River are, his continuing example as a public spirited citizen is even more important, because it inspires others to serve in like manner. His many contributions to the civic, spiritual, and cultural spheres of community life have built even greater bridges for better understanding than these new spans across Connecticut's historic waterway.

Mr. President, our final destiny as a nation depends upon the continuing erection of spiritual bridges to bring us close together as Americans in a dedicated and determined effort to conform to the dictates of our Creator. We in Connecticut are closer because of what Bill Putnam is and because of what he has done. His recognition is most deserved, because, Mr. President, great as it has already become, the value of the service of William H. Putnam will continue to grow in magnitude with the years as the ideals which it has helped to foster spread among our people.

EXTENSION OF THE TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I have just read the President's message regarding the extension of the Trade Agreements Act.

I shall support the President's recommendation for a 5-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act. In the world in which we live, stability of trade relationships among the free nations is an essential element in our counterattack to the Communist bloc's economic offensive. Such stability will be promoted by a long-term extension of the act.

I make this endorsement in the expectation that the administration will recommend, and the Congress will approve, methods of strengthening the existing safeguards for domestic industry, and improving their administration.

I understand that subsequent recommendations from the administration will cover these matters.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to join the Senator from Connecticut in expressing support for the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements

Act for 5 years. I do this because I think it is important to indicate to the country and to indicate to the President that there is support for him in the Senate of the United States in these actions which are absolutely vital to the national security—as vital in their own way as getting ready on missiles and rocketry.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator very much for those observations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I am glad to yield, if time permits.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to join with the Senator from New York in expressing support of the principle of the extension of the reciprocal trade agreement program for another 5 years.

As the Senator from Connecticut knows, I have always supported that principle. I have been critical of its application in some instances, when I thought our State Department did not carry out the real objective of the reciprocal trade agreements, because the act itself is based upon the controlling principle of reciprocity.

In some instances reciprocity has been noted for its absence in some of the arrangements which the State Department has made with foreign countries, to the detriment of American industry.

Mr. President, I intend in this session of Congress, as I have in past sessions of Congress, to give my support to the objective of reciprocal trade, because I will say to the American people that the contest for freedom in the decades ahead is going to be costly and we are not going to win if we try to separate ourselves from the rest of the world. The rest of the world is on the march, so far as raising the economic standards of people in the underdeveloped countries of the world is concerned. The question facing the American people is whether we are going to recognize the relationship between economic freedom of choice and political freedom of choice, or whether we are going to drive the people of these underdeveloped countries into the economic arms of Russia. Once they are in the economic arms of Russia, then they will have imposed upon them the enslavement which goes along with political totalitarianism.

I think in this session of Congress, irrespective of a great deal of political criticism we are going to receive, we are going to have to face up to the great issue of whether we are going to participate in an economic program abroad which will help raise the standard of living of those people who have to be brought over to our side in this great contest between freedom and totalitarianism.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his observations.

Mr. MORTON rose.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] has asked me to yield to him on his own time.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the Senator from Connecticut.

I think in the world situation today what is needed, among other things, is a greater range for our trade policies. When we go along from year to year, or from 2 years to 2 years, on this program, there are obviously created certain questions abroad. I am glad to see that the Secretary of Commerce is to come before the Congress and submit to the Congress further proposed legislation to protect American industry. I hope the Congress will grant the 5-year extension.

I also hope, Mr. President, that the Congress will take another look at the Organization for Trade Cooperation, which has been before the Congress, after being submitted some 3 years ago by the administration. The Organization for Trade Cooperation will never come into being unless the United States joins it. I think such an organization will not only be an aid for all trade, but a great safeguard to American industry and American enterprise if we set up the policing force of the OTC to see that the trade arrangements are properly carried out.

I am happy to join with the Senator from Connecticut in urging careful consideration of the program.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. LAUSCHE rose.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I should like to yield, if I may, to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], on his own time in the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to join in the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

In the contest of nations throughout the world it is apparent that we must have allies. We cannot stand alone. We must have friends, and to achieve the friendship of many nations we either have to help them maintain an independent economy or give them alms.

In my opinion alms do not edify the character of the recipient. Alms degrade, and frequently bring a result contrary to that expected by the giver. We cannot have a one-way street in the commerce of our country. We cannot expect other nations to buy from us while we bluntly tell them that we will not buy from them.

As for myself, I believe that the ultimate security and the ultimate economic richness of every man in America is related to the security of our country. While we may suffer a bit by granting rights to sell in our country, the aggregate gains which we make from the standpoint of security far exceed that which we lose.

I know, as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has stated, that there will be many who take exception to the President's recommendation. To them I make the plea to look not only at the immediate results, but weigh and consider the long range impact of what is being done. Immediately, we may lose a bit, but in the aggregate, and in the end,

the life of our country will be insured, and eventually the richness provided by that life will benefit all Americans.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

THE RISING TIDE OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am deeply concerned over the rising tide of unemployment in the Nation. Almost daily, the newspapers carry articles of the increasing number of jobless throughout the country. As is well known, the estimates indicate that the number of jobless is well up toward 4 million. According to the latest survey by the Labor Department, 45 of the Nation's 149 major industrial centers are areas of substantial unemployment. An area falls in the surplus labor category when more than 6 percent of the working force is idle. Thus, overall unemployment is now dangerously high.

We are aware, of course, that employment is basically a private economic problem. However, the Government—as an instrument to serve the people—I believe, cannot stand idly by and let growing unemployment play havoc with the economy and our people. Instead, I believe it has a responsibility to aid, wherever it reasonably and properly can, in dealing with these problems.

Currently, I am not satisfied that enough is being done in this field. As we know, the Defense Department in particular, can—and in some cases, does—offer relief to labor surplus areas. For the most part this is accomplished by channeling contracts and production into those areas.

NEED FOR MORE ACTION

To stimulate greater action along this line, I have taken definite steps, as follows:

First, I have contacted the Defense Department to urge that existing facilities that are idle, or practically idle, be utilized as much as possible to fulfill our current defense needs. In the days ahead, the Congress will be asked for appropriations to construct, and/or contract for, facilities to produce defense materiel. Prior to such requests, every attempt should be made to use existing plants and other facilities.

Second, I have urged the Office of Defense Mobilization to make greater use of Defense Manpower Policy No. 4. This policy authorizes ODM to set aside defense contracts for areas hard hit by unemployment. Regrettably, almost nothing has been done along this line recently.

Third, We all appreciate the difficulties faced by small-business men in complying with the requirements of Federal contracts. To deal with this problem, I have contacted the Small Business Administration to urge that a special study be made of such problems in fulfilling Federal contracts. In addition, I urged that administrative action be taken to actively aid small businesses in fulfilling such contracts.

HEADING OFF INCREASING UNEMPLOYMENT

I point out this situation because many Senators may be faced with prob-

lems of increasing unemployment in their home States, as we are in Wisconsin.

For example, increasing unemployment has hit a number of Badger communities. Regrettably, the percentage of out-of-job workers has risen as high as 10 percent over 1956 in some areas.

To cope with this situation, I recently requested that a procurement expert, Mr. Kenneth Borgen, of the Defense Department, survey the problem in Wisconsin. The objective was to attempt to channel defense and other Federal contracts into areas affected by rising unemployment.

We are now engaging in followup action through local, State, and Federal cooperation.

Believing this approach toward attempting to head off ever-increasing unemployment to be of interest, I request unanimous consent to have my letters to the Defense Department, the Small Business Administration, and the Office of Defense Mobilization, printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
January 30, 1958.

Hon. NEIL MCELROY,
Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to urge that a greater effort be made to utilize existing facilities for producing materiel needed for strengthening our defense program.

As you are well aware, there are a number of production facilities across the Nation which either are now idle, or partially idle. For example, our fine ordnance plant at Baraboo, Wis., produces propellant powder. During full operation it employs up to 6,000 workers. Currently, it is practically idle.

As a result the economy of the surrounding community is suffering because of unemployment. This single situation is multiplied by the number of areas in which similar plants are inactive, or only partially active, across the country.

We recognize, of course, the need for maintaining an adequate production base, as at Baraboo, to produce essential materiel in the event of national emergency. At the same time, I'm sure you agree that aside from such a possibly remote contingency, we should right now utilize available facilities to fulfill our current defense and other needs.

In the days ahead, the Defense Department will be constructing or contracting for, facilities to produce new defense materiel.

Prior to such action, I would very respectfully urge that the available inventories of facilities be examined carefully to see whether or not action can be taken along the following lines:

1. Idle, or partially idle, plants be recon-verted (as possible) to production of other defense materiel currently in greater demand;

2. Plants that cannot feasibly be recon-verted should be:

(a) Leased for production of other (possibly civilian) goods—without, of course, interfering with essential defense missions; or

(b) Made available for returning to production of civilian goods, as soon as possible when its output is no longer needed for defense.

To the degree that this can be accomplished, it would, of course, cut costs,

strengthen the defense, and assist the economy of local communities in which these facilities are located.

I respectfully urge, therefore, that a review of this situation be undertaken and that constructive attempts be made to more effectively and completely utilize existing facilities for strengthening the defense program.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

JANUARY 3, 1958.

Mr. GORDON GRAY,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization,
Executive Office of the President,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GRAY: I am writing to urge a greater application of Defense Manpower Policy No. 4—the set-aside program for assigning defense contracts to labor surplus areas—and also to urge the appointment of a Director of Contracts for Surplus Labor Areas for channeling of more Federal contracts into areas hard hit by unemployment.

Regrettably, as you know, the set-aside program has been seriously lagging. In all candor, it is pitifully inadequate. An extremely small percentage of our defense contracts have been earmarked annually for labor surplus areas. In fact, in the last quarter for which information is available—July 1 to September 30, 1957—the preferential assignment of contracts to surplus labor areas was zero.

This is extremely unfortunate when, by dedicated effort, the program could be expanded to provide effective assistance in filling defense contracts in labor surplus areas.

To carry out the program more effectively, I believe the appointment of a Director of Contracts, familiar with the labor situation as well as with Federal contracting, could aid tremendously in reviewing defense contracts, prior to assignment, so that more of these could go into labor surplus areas.

As you know, the specter of unemployment is unhappily rising in the Nation. In Wisconsin, for example, we have had increases in unemployment of more than 10 percent over 1956, in a number of communities. Presently, I am attempting to assist our Wisconsin industries in acquiring some Federal contracts to help relieve the acute unemployment situation.

The expansion, and more effective application, of the set-aside program, therefore, I believe would be of tremendous help in attempting to resolve this, and similar, problems in the future.

By so doing, we would help to keep in operation an industrial capability that is essential to our peacetime progress, as well as for defense.

With appreciation for the consideration I know these recommendations will receive, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

JANUARY 3, 1958.

Mr. WENDELL BARNES,
Director, Small Business Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BARNES: I am writing to urge that the Small Business Administration undertake a special study on problems relating to fulfilling Federal procurement contracts by small business, and also to urge that an administrative action program be set up to help small-business men fulfill these contracts.

As you are well aware, the particularly difficult problems in meeting the Federal standards and requirements often exclude small business from participating in Federal procurement programs. Among these problems, of course, are: Maintaining a reserve of adequate funds to carry on operations during fulfillment of contracts; lack of as-

stance in acquiring hard-to-get materials; lack of guidance in adaption of facilities to fulfill Government contracts; and others.

I know, of course, that you are currently attempting to assist small business in this and other fields.

Because these problems are tough ones, however, I believe that a special effort is needed to provide assistance and guidance in fulfilling Federal contracts. It would be of tremendous benefit, not only in providing small business a larger share of Federal contracting, but also assisting in resolving community and national economic problems.

For example, you are aware, of course, of increasing unemployment throughout the country. A number of industries in Wisconsin communities, too, are unfortunately laying off men, operating shorter hours, or otherwise cutting back production. Thus, the problem of unemployment is threatening the whole economy of these communities.

Currently, I am attempting to assist these areas in acquiring additional Federal contracts to stimulate business so as to increase employment. However, we recognize that the local small businesses, in this instance, often require additional aid and guidance in attempting to meet the requirements of these contracts.

I would, therefore, respectfully suggest that a special effort be made to resolve the problems confronting small business in meeting the standards and specifications of Federal contracting, by undertaking a study of these problems, as well as taking appropriate administrative action to provide needed assistance in Federal procurement contracting.

With appreciation for the consideration I know these suggestions will receive, I remain

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

FOREIGN STUDENTS STUDYING IN THE UNITED STATES—THE SPLENDID WORK OF INDUSTRIES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have previously brought to the attention of my colleagues the great importance of foreign students studying in our midst. The record will show that the relatively small amounts of money involved in this program have brought immeasurable value to our country in promotion of good will and understanding.

As my colleagues are aware, the International Education Exchange Service of the Department of State administers this exchange program. It does so with the help of two public boards, appointed by the President, namely, the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange and the Board of Foreign Scholarship.

The Advisory Commission formulates and recommends to the Secretary of State policies and programs for carrying out the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948. In turn, the Board of Foreign Scholarship supervises program operations. It selects individuals and educational institutions qualified to participate in the exchange program authorized by the Fulbright Act.

The record will show that the foreign students who have studied here have returned to their countries to occupy posts of ever-increasing importance in all phases of the life of their homelands.

In turn, of course, we welcome the opportunity to have American youngsters study abroad and become better acquainted with the lives and cultures and contributions of foreign lands.

Today, I bring to the attention of my colleagues, however, one specific phase of what can be done, and is being done, with foreign students.

I refer once more to the excellent work of the nonprofit corporation known as Industries International, Inc., located in Janesville, in my State.

I was pleased to receive today from Mr. A. Roger Hook, executive director of Industries International, a memorandum giving the splendid reactions of foreign embassies in our Nation's Capital to the program.

What is the program? As I have previously reported to my colleagues, it is designed to assist foreign students to locate industrial opportunity when they return to their homeland; primarily through licensing agreements with United States companies.

This is a two-way street. It is of value economically to the United States in developing foreign markets. It is of value to foreign lands in improving standards of living, furthering trade, increasing production, distribution, and employment.

This is but one of the many byproducts of the foreign students exchange program. It is a very practical byproduct. Even if there were not such an economic program, the student exchange program would be worth while from any standpoint.

But it is gratifying to know that this Industries International has resulted as one out of many practical applications of the overall program.

This is, of course, entirely a private, nonprofit program, not, in any respect, a governmental program.

I send to the desk the memorandum to which I have referred, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDUSTRIES INTERNATIONAL INC.,
Janesville, Wis., February 1958.

AMBASSADOR ENDORSES PRACTICAL TRAINING FOR FOREIGN STUDENTS

During the past 2 years Industries International, Inc., has carefully and diligently developed a program to assist foreign students in finding industrial opportunities in their homeland, primarily through licensing agreements with United States companies, to help them secure practical training upon completion of their academic training, and to aid business firms in this country locate foreign nationals for their overseas operations.

The program has been recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—it is backed by United States Government agencies, universities, large business firms, and many organizations throughout the world. It is generally recognized that United States business firms are becoming more and more dependent on overseas business, also that importation of certain raw materials is now a requisite for practically all types of United States manufacturing. Foreign governments are naturally aware of this situation and are in a position to decide which countries and which individual firms serve the interests of

their people best. United States business firms with adequate trainee programs for the young people from overseas, obviously have a great advantage and are receiving very favorable publicity throughout the world. From time to time the foreign ambassadors, and foreign government agencies are advised through circulars such as this of the work of Industries International, Inc. In order that you might know of their great interest in our program, we are pleased to report from a few of the letters we have received from high foreign government offices—

LIBERIA

"Having been the first President of the Y's Mens Club of Liberia, I feel that I am in a position to appreciate the great and inestimable contributions this worthy organization is making. It is my prayer and hope that you will be sustained with renewed vigor and your heart will be encouraged as you press forward to meet the challenge of this new day."

ECUADOR

"It seems to me that your organization is carrying out a very important job by helping young students and graduates of foreign countries to get the kind of practical training demanded in their specific fields of specialization. This function, undoubtedly, is a great contribution toward the efforts not only of the student, but those of governmental agencies here and abroad, whose task is to seek and provide a better training for the students.

"As you point out in your information material, this training is difficult to get for foreign students, due to different reasons, from legal technicalities to the impossibility of finding suitable places for such training. Therefore, I have only words of praise to your initiative and I hope that some Ecuadorian students coming to the United States may profit out of this opportunity."

KOREA

"As you may already know, there are some 1,800 Korean students in this country now and our Governments' scholarship program is steadily expanding. It would be of immeasurable advantage to them if training opportunities, however brief, could be found for them."

FINLAND

"It was very interesting for me to learn about your program which gives the foreign students who attend universities and colleges in this country the opportunity to seek practical training here. If I, in any way, can give you any assistance in this field, please let me know."

SPAIN

"I honestly think that you are on the right track in getting the best understanding and cooperation among young generations all over the world. Let me congratulate you for the fine work you are doing and thank you for keeping me informed about your interesting work."

PAKISTAN

"Most of our students after completion of their training seek opportunities for practical training before their departure for Pakistan. We will be most grateful if you kindly furnish us detailed information as well as forms of application so that students approaching us on such subjects may be supplied with an application form to be forwarded to you."

REPUBLIC OF PANAMA

"The world backward living conditions resulting from idle human and natural resources as the ones prevailing in Panama as well as in many other countries are not going to prevail forever. It is becoming more difficult for a country to be out than to be in the present industrial development.

Usually I am short of time; however, Industries International, Inc., plan can have my assistance if necessary."

BRITISH WEST INDIES

"I should like to repeat my previous assurance that the work you are doing is first rate and most important. I am sure you will find that there is enough demand on hand from students already in the United States to keep you busy and as the scheme becomes better known both to industry and to the students it will snowball. It is especially important in the engineering and technological fields where there has in the past been reluctance on the part of industry to take in foreign trainees on the grounds that the services of the trainee will be lost when he returns home. This is shortsighted."

ISRAEL

"Thank you very much indeed for remembering us in connection with the Industries International, Inc. Your project looks most interesting and worth while. We have in the past encountered problems for which your project might very well provide a solution."

INDIA

"I am indeed very interested in the program you have developed to help foreign students find industrial opportunities when they return home. If there is any way in which you think I can be of assistance to you, I shall be glad to hear from you again."

CHILE

"I compliment you upon this very useful project that fills a long-felt need. While it is true that academic courses try to bring as much practical knowledge as possible to the students, there is no training so valuable as that obtained by working in shop, or factory, or in the field, under wage-earner discipline, with experienced men. The know-how thus obtained is a valuable asset to take to the student's country, and is greatly appreciated."

GREAT BRITAIN

"This is indeed a very worthwhile project; and I can bear ample testimony to the need not only for increased opportunity for foreign students to acquire industrial experience in their various fields of training, but for an enlightened central organization which is prepared to go to the trouble to bring the student into contact with firms which can provide fitting opportunities."

Congratulations have been received from the White House and from many foreign ambassadors for the excellent cooperation of the International Y's Men's Clubs in this important work.

We believe you will be pleased to know a plan has been worked out to permit United States business firms to become identified with this important builder of good will. We shall be happy to explain the program to you.

A. ROGER HOOK,
Executive Director.

CONTINUATION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 320)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

I request the Congress to enact legislation that will permit a continuation of the reciprocal trade agreements pro-

gram on an effective basis for a minimum of 5 additional years past June 30, 1958.

The enactment of this legislation—unweakened by amendments of a kind that would impair its effectiveness—is essential to our national economic interest, to our security, and to our foreign relations.

The high importance of trade to our economy is evident. The income of our people arising from export trade alone approximates or exceeds that arising from many major segments of our economy. The development of a healthy export trade has created a significant number of jobs for our working men and women. Imports furnish our industries with essential raw materials and the benefits of technological advances, add to the variety of goods available to our consumers, and also create jobs for our workers. Moreover, important geographical areas within our country, as well as many of our key industries in both manufacturing and agriculture, look to expanding world trade as an essential ingredient of their future prosperity.

Reciprocal trade agreements negotiated since the advent of the Trade Agreements Act have helped bring a more vigorous, dynamic growth to our American economy. Our own economic self-interest, therefore, demands a continuation of the trade-agreements program. Under this program sound two-way trade can be further developed to assure to our industries widening opportunities for participation in world markets, and to provide foreign nations the opportunity to earn the dollars to pay for the goods we sell. We can either receive the benefits of the reciprocal lowering of trade barriers or suffer the inevitable alternative of increasingly high barriers against our own commerce which would weaken our economy and jeopardize American jobs.

Important as growing international trade is to our country, it is equally important to our allies and trading partners. For them it is indeed vital to the health and growing strength of their economies, on which their political stability and military power heavily depend. The assured future of the reciprocal trade program is necessary for our national security and for our entire foreign policy.

In particular, it is essential to enable us to meet the latest form of economic challenge to the free world presented by communism. In the state of the Union message, I spoke of the economic offensive that has been mounted against free nations by the Communist imperialists. The Soviet Union is engaged in an intensive effort, through combined programs of trade and aid, to divide the countries of the free world, to detach them one by one and swing them into the orbit of Communist influence.

We must recognize the growing capacity of the Soviet Union in the economic field. Their advances in technology and industrialization, together with their continuing repression of domestic consumption, enable them to supply, better than ever before, the machinery, manufactures, and other goods which are

essential to the economic life of many countries.

The Soviet capacity to export is matched by its capacity and willingness to import. It is increasingly offering to import the surpluses of non-Communist states. In this way it seeks to tie such states to the Soviet orbit, and to exploit the trade difficulties of the free world.

This challenge in the economic field cannot be ignored without the gravest risk to our way of life. This fact alone makes it imperative that previous positions be reexamined, and that particular interests be reappraised in the light of overriding national needs.

The question is whether the system of free competitive enterprise for which we stand will meet successfully in the international economic arena the challenge hurled by the Soviet leaders.

We will fail in this endeavor if the free countries do not continue their reduction of the barriers which they themselves impose on their trade with each other. We will fail if closed markets and foreign-exchange shortages force free-world countries into economic dependence upon the Communist bloc. We will fail if the United States should now abandon the task of building a world-trading system from which all free-world countries can gain strength and prosperity in a free economic society.

If our Government is to play its decisive part in protecting and strengthening the free economic system against the Communist threat, the trade agreements legislation which the administration is requesting of the Congress must be enacted.

The Secretary of Commerce, who is Chairman of the Trade Policy Committee which I recently established to advise and assist me in the administration of the trade-agreements program, including review of recommendations of the United States Tariff Commission, will transmit to the Congress the administration's legislative proposals. These proposals, including the various safeguards for domestic industry, will generally follow the pattern set by the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955.

The amount of tariff reduction authority to be requested is essential to the continuing success of the program, as is the 5-year period of the proposed extension to the continuity in our trade relations.

There is a further and very specific factor necessitating a minimum extension of 5 years. Six European nations, which purchased nearly \$3 billion of our exports last year, have established a European Economic Community which will become a common market with a population nearly as large as our own. These countries will ultimately have a common tariff applying to imports from the rest of the world. It is anticipated that important steps toward this common tariff will become effective during 1962—up to 4½ years from the renewal date of our trade-agreements legislation. This period must be devoted to negotiations with the new economic community and these negotiations must be preceded by painstaking preparations. Both preparation and negotiation must be based on a clear grant of adequate au-

thority. This timetable requires an extension of the legislation for a minimum of 5 years. Such an extension, with the tariff reduction authority to be requested, is necessary to carry the trade-agreements program through the early formative years of the European Economic Community and strengthen our ability to further vital American interests there and elsewhere in the world.

The 5-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act with broadened authority to negotiate is essential to America's vital national interests. It will strengthen our economy which is the foundation of our national security. It will enhance the economic health and strength of the free world. It will provide a powerful force in waging total peace.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 30, 1958.

CONVENTIONS WITH BELGIUM AND UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND, RELATING TO DOUBLE TAXATION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the President of the United States has transmitted to the Senate today:

First. A convention with Belgium for the prevention of double taxation and fiscal evasion; and

Second. A notification by Great Britain and Northern Ireland looking to the extension to certain British overseas territories of a convention for the prevention of double taxation and fiscal evasion.

As in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from these documents, and that the documents, together with the President's messages, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's messages be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The documents were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Executive B, 85th Congress, 2d session, a convention between the United States of America and Belgium, signed at Washington on August 22, 1957, supplementing the convention of October 28, 1948, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, as modified by the supplementary convention of September 9, 1952.

The message from the President of the United States accompanying Executive B is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit the convention between the United States of America and Belgium, signed at Washington on August 22, 1957, supplementing the convention of October 28, 1948, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, as modified by the supplementary convention of September 9, 1952.

The new supplementary convention is designed to facilitate the extension of

the 1948 convention, as modified, to the Belgian Congo and the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi.

I transmit also an English translation of a note dated April 2, 1954, addressed by the Ambassador of Belgium to the Secretary of State, constituting a notification by the Belgian Government under article XXII of the 1948 convention for the purpose of extending the operation of that convention, as modified, to the Belgian Congo and the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi. It is desired that, in conjunction with the consideration of the supplementary convention, the Senate consider and approve the acceptance by the United States Government of the Belgian Government's notification.

I transmit also for the information of the Senate the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the supplementary convention and the notification, both of which have the approval of the Department of State and the Department of the Treasury.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 30, 1958.

(Enclosures: 1. Report by the Secretary of State; 2. convention of August 22, 1957, supplementing the income-tax convention of 1948, as modified, between the United States and Belgium; 3. translation of note of April 2, 1954, Ambassador of Belgium to the Secretary of State.)

Executive C, 85th Congress, 2d session, a notification given by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland with a view to extending to certain British overseas territories the application of the convention of April 16, 1945, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, as modified by supplementary protocols of June 6, 1946, May 25, 1954, and August 19, 1957.

The message from the President of the United States accompanying Executive C is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the approval of the Senate, if the Senate approve thereof, I transmit herewith a notification given by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland with a view to extending to certain British overseas territories the application of the convention of April 16, 1945, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, as modified by supplementary protocols of June 6, 1946, May 25, 1954, and August 19, 1957.

The notification is embodied in a note dated August 19, 1957, from the British Ambassador in Washington to the Secretary of State, a copy of which is transmitted herewith, together with a copy of the annex thereto.

I transmit also for the information of the Senate the report by the Acting Secretary of State with respect to the proposed extension, which has the approval of the Department of State and the Department of the Treasury.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 30, 1958.

(Enclosures: 1. Report by the Acting Secretary of State; 2. Note, with enclosure, from the British Ambassador to the Secretary of State, August 19, 1957.)

PRICE SUPPORTS FOR TOBACCO

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I was very much surprised to note that the administration had reversed its policy concerning price supports for tobacco. In his agriculture message of January 16, the President asked for administrative authority to set price supports at between 60 percent and 90 percent of parity for cotton, wheat, corn, rice, peanuts, tobacco, and dairy products. The price supports for all of these, except tobacco, are now administratively controlled within the range of 75 percent to 90 percent of parity. In the case of tobacco, the support price is inflexible, and is fixed at 90 percent.

In the message, I was disappointed at the position taken by the Department of Agriculture concerning tobacco. It is my hope and belief that the Congress will not scrap the present tobacco-support program. It was established as law by the adoption of the Cooper amendment nearly 10 years ago. It has had the endorsement of this administration until January 16. Over the years it has proved itself as a sound and practical program.

Frankly, I do not know why the Department of Agriculture changed its position. I realize that public impact and reaction, as well as Congressional impact and reaction, must be considered in the preparation of any major Presidential message. I am inclined to believe that the Secretary of Agriculture and his advisers felt that it would jeopardize the case for more flexible price supports if any exceptions were spelled out in a document such as a Presidential message. Probably it was felt that the force of the message would be weakened by the complexities which would invariably develop in explaining exceptions.

Mr. President, it might be well to review briefly not only the legislative history, but also the history of administration policy, in connection with tobacco price supports. On June 17, 1948, during the 2d session of the 80th Congress, the Senate adopted the Cooper amendment to Senate bill 2318, the long-range agricultural program. This amendment established at 90 percent of parity the level of price support to cooperators for any crop of tobacco for which marketing quotas were in effect. The substance of the amendment was accepted by the House, and became law. In making his vigorous fight for the amendment, my senior colleague, Senator COOPER, had the support of many Senators from the tobacco-producing States who still are serving in this body. Senator COOPER rendered a great service, not only to the tobacco producers of Kentucky, but also to those of the entire United States, by

his signal achievement in this legislation. Since his amendment became law, the program has worked to the benefit of the producer, without cost to the taxpayer, and without any appreciable cost to the consumer.

On January 11, 1954, the agriculture message from the President was received by the 2d session of the 84th Congress. The message contained the following paragraphs dealing with tobacco:

Tobacco farmers have demonstrated their ability to hold production in line with demand at the supported price without loss to the Government. The relatively small acreage of tobacco and the limited areas to which it is adapted have made production control easier than for other crops.

The level of support to cooperators is 90 percent of the parity price in any year in which marketing quotas are in effect.

It is recommended that the tobacco program be continued in its present form.

I happen to know that the logical and irrefutable arguments advanced by Senator COOPER largely influenced the administration in accepting this policy position concerning the support prices for tobacco. It was the first time that any administration had taken such a position. It was a sound position at the time and it is equally sound today.

It has been repeatedly pointed out that tobacco is a unique product. Just why it is a unique product is sometimes overlooked. Tobacco is subject to much more stringent and exacting acreage controls than is any other product. Tobacco is not measured in acres, in half acres, or in quarter acres. In the case of tobacco, the measurement actually goes down to hundredths of an acre. Every producer of tobacco would like to have a larger base. Yet, as a group, the producers overwhelmingly support the stringent control program as being a necessity, in view of the nature of the crop. The marketing of tobacco is also unique. Most of that which is raised for domestic consumption is purchased by 5 or 6 large buyers. Furthermore, production and consumption have been kept in near balance. Surpluses have accumulated in the past, but they have been liquidated without Government subsidy, and at practically no cost to the taxpayers.

Many persons labor under the misapprehension that the tobacco support program is responsible for the increase in the price of cigarettes. This is not the case, and the record should be set straight on this matter. In the last 25 years, the retail price of cigarettes has just about doubled. We can all remember when popular brands were sold at retail for less than 15 cents a package. Today, they are nearly 30 cents. Most of this increase is the result, not of rising tobacco prices, but of higher costs for packaging and distribution and higher taxes. The Federal tax on a package of cigarettes was 6 cents in January 1933; and today it is 8 cents a package. More significant are the taxes now assessed by most States on the sale of tobacco products. In some States this amounts to as much as 4 cents a package. The actual cost of the tobacco in the average package of cigarettes today is only about 15 percent of the retail selling price. It is

quite clear, then, that the support program for tobacco prices has not been the important factor in the increased price of cigarettes and other tobacco products.

Above all, what makes tobacco a unique product is the fact that no other product can be substituted for it, nor can it be substituted for any other product. Tobacco has a very specific and limited end use. It is neither food nor fiber. The per capita consumption of tobacco is fairly constant from year to year. A sharp drop in price would not lead to a sharp increase in domestic consumption. For this reason, the tobacco problem is quite different from that which is found in the other basic agricultural commodities.

Let us take wheat as an example. In this country, the per capita human consumption of wheat products is almost constant from year to year. Over the past 70 years, it has declined; but the decline has been gradual. As the standard of living has gone up, the diet of the average American family has become more varied, and the consumption of bread and other wheat products has gone down. However, there are other uses of wheat. It is an important source of proteins and carbohydrates in livestock and poultry feeds. When the price of wheat goes down in relation to the prices of corn and soy beans and other feed grains, the use of wheat as a source of animal feed goes up. Unlike tobacco, wheat and all other basic crops compete for their share of the market; and in any competition, price is a factor. In the case of cotton, the competition comes from the synthetic fibers and, to an extent, from wool.

Secretary Benson is asking for more flexible price supports, in order to prevent the accumulation of market depressing surpluses. We in the Congress may disagree on how to prevent surpluses, but I am sure all of us agree that their accumulation endangers the farm economy. In the case of many agricultural products, one can logically argue that lower prices lead to increased usage and the elimination of surpluses. In the case of tobacco, this argument does not apply. Domestic consumption is fairly constant, and does not vary within any reasonable price range. Flexible price supports are, therefore, not the answer to the problem of surplus tobacco control.

So far, I have discussed tobacco from the standpoint of domestic consumption. Let us look at the export picture. I have often heard it said that because of the tobacco-support program, we are pricing ourselves out of the world market. It is true that tobacco is being raised in many parts of the world that produced none or very little prior to World War II. However, insofar as the export of burley tobacco is concerned, if we have priced ourselves out of the market, it is not because of the support program, but is because of the changed buying habits of the American consumer.

The grades of burley tobacco which traditionally have been exported are the harsher, stronger, or higher nicotine grades. The leaves providing these grades come from the top of the plant. The grades used in domestic cigarettes

in the past were the milder grades, and came from the lower leaves on the plant. This traditional pattern has been completely changed with the introduction of the filter cigarette. A few manufacturers started pushing the filter. The public likes it. All the major tobacco manufacturers, whether they wanted to or not, have had not only to produce the filter cigarette, but also to merchandise it aggressively, in order to maintain their share of the market. If one is to get any sense of taste in smoking a filter cigarette, the tobacco blend must be changed. Some stronger and higher nicotine leaves must be substituted for some of the milder mixture of the conventional cigarette. This has been done, and recently there has been a great demand for the grades of burley tobacco which formerly were a drug on the market, and which made up most of our export poundage.

Before the introduction of the filter, the so-called lower grades sold for substantially less than the higher grades. In normal years, the price of the lower grades was less than half that of the better grades. Today, because of the increased domestic demand for the lower grades, this differential has virtually disappeared. The cigarette manufacturers, in anticipating their future needs for the type of burley tobacco necessary for the filtered product, have been very aggressive in purchasing the grades of tobacco which formerly went into the export market.

During the past 10 years there has been a fairly steady advance in the general price of tobacco, not only in this country, but also abroad. Our support program may have played some part in that advance. However, the sharp and radical price advance in the lower grades which formerly made up our export poundage has not been the result of the price-support program. It has come about because the American consumer wants the filter cigarette, and the manufacturer buys the type of tobacco needed to make that a satisfying cigarette.

The answer to our tobacco export problem, certainly insofar as burley is concerned, will not be found by changing the support program. It is a serious problem, and one which now is being studied by the best brains in the country. It is a problem to which all of us who are interested in the welfare of the tobacco producer and the tobacco industry should address our attention. The research work in the chemistry of tobacco now being carried on at the University of Kentucky may prove of great value in finding the answer. But let us not deceive ourselves into thinking that a change in our support program will be the answer. The future of the American farm family is the most serious home-front challenge facing the Congress and the administration. Bold and courageous steps may be required to meet the challenge. In taking those steps, let us not kick over one of the few programs that is working in a satisfactory manner. A study of the tobacco problem leads to these conclusions:

First. The tobacco price-support program has not been a burden to the taxpayer.

Second. The program has not been a serious factor in the increased cost to the consumer.

Third. The domestic consumption of tobacco will not be increased by price reduction.

Fourth. The end use of tobacco is limited. It neither competes with, nor is it subject to competition from, any other product.

Fifth. The dilemma faced by the exporters of burley tobacco results from the innovation of the filter cigarette, not from the price-support program.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate my colleague, the Junior Senator from Kentucky, on his very fine statement in support of the tobacco program. He has presented the arguments in support of the present tobacco program clearly and strongly. I know that his effective statement will be welcomed by tobacco farmers, and by the entire tobacco industry.

I thank him for his kind reference to my long fight for the tobacco program. It is true that 10 years ago, on June 17, 1948, I prepared and introduced in the Senate, joined by the late Senator Barkley, the amendment to give tobacco growers a fixed, permanent support price equal to 90 percent of parity.

It was a hard fight, and the vote in the Senate was 41 to 40. I give credit again to the members of the Senate Conference Committee, of both the Democratic and Republican parties, and to my friends on this side of the aisle, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Thye] who stood firmly in support of the Senate position. As a result, the amendment was accepted by the House and became law. The amendment providing fixed support at 90 percent of parity has been the law ever since.

I wish to give credit also to my colleagues of both parties, in my own State and in all the tobacco States—North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, Tennessee, Georgia, Maryland, Florida, West Virginia, Missouri, and Ohio—to the Farm Bureaus, marketing cooperatives, and other farm groups, and to the individual support of tobacco growers themselves, for their part in establishing and in helping maintain on a sound basis the present tobacco program.

It is true also, as the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] has kindly recalled, that I did urge Secretary Benson, and the President personally, in 1953 and in 1954, to maintain this amendment in the President's farm recommendations of 1954. And in his message of January 11, 1954, the President said in regard to tobacco:

Tobacco farmers have demonstrated their ability to hold production in line with demand at the supported price without loss to the Government. The relatively small acreage of tobacco and the limited areas to which it is adapted have made production control easier than for other crops.

The level of support to cooperators is 90 percent of the parity price in any year in which marketing quotas are in effect.

It is recommended that the tobacco program be continued in its present form.

I will not today repeat the arguments for the continuance of the present tobacco program. The junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] has stated them well. Last August 30, in a statement which I prepared, and which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, I presented at length the case for maintaining the present separate and distinct tobacco program, the continued need for it, and its substantial record of accomplishment.

Nevertheless, in the President's latest farm message, of January 16, which represents the views of the Secretary of Agriculture, tobacco is included among the basic farm commodities now under flexible supports, and for which the Secretary seeks discretionary authority to reduce supports to some unknown figure, down to 60 percent of parity.

There is nothing in the history of the tobacco program since 1948 which justifies this recommendation, and I strongly oppose it.

Nothing has happened since 1948, when the Congress acted to make 90 percent supports for tobacco a permanent provision of law, or since 1954, when the President recommended the continuation of that program, or since August of last year, to change the strength of these arguments for maintenance of fixed price supports for tobacco at 90 percent of parity.

On the contrary, the record to date more strongly supports the power and logic of the decision of 1954 to maintain the fixed, permanent support at 90 percent of parity, as it has been since 1948.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rule of the morning hour, a Senator is recognized for 3 minutes. Without objection, the Senator from Kentucky will be recognized for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized for a short additional period of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I shall briefly make three points today, which I hope may support the fine argument of my colleague.

First, the present tobacco program has been, and is, a success. The great farm problem of the administration, and indeed of all farmers, is to bring production in line with consumption for all farm crops. This tobacco growers have done, under the present tobacco program. No more dramatic evidence could be offered than this action of the growers themselves. The growers themselves have adjusted production to the rapidly changing conditions of the last 4 years, which my colleague from Kentucky has described.

The Department of Agriculture, which now suggests a change in the program, has itself recognized the success of the program. It has done this by recommending for each of the last 3 years that the quotas for burley tobacco growers remain the same. This is the indisputable proof that, for tobacco, production is for all practical purposes in line with consumption.

What more can the Secretary of Agriculture ask?

Second, the tobacco growers in every State, including Kentucky, are satisfied with the program, and support it. It has received the overwhelming support of tobacco farmers in their votes for the program taken in referenda for 18 consecutive years and they were never stronger in their support than they are today.

I know that the Secretary of Agriculture has emphasized again and again that a farm program must have the support of the farmers themselves if it is to be successful. What better evidence can there be of this support by the tobacco farmers themselves, and I think I can say of the entire tobacco industry, than their democratic choice of the present tobacco program, with price support at 90 percent of parity, than these votes favoring marketing quotas by 95, 97, and even 98 percent in free elections?

I might say also that it is a fact that on the whole, over the period of its operation, the program has not cost the Government of the United States money.

Third, I should like to say something about prices. All of us want the American farmer, and I can say for myself the Kentucky farmer, to have a fair share of the growing national income. While the farmers' life has compensations which are enjoyed by no other life in America, yet that fact does not deny the right of the farmers to a fair income.

Many farmers who grow other crops do not have such a share of the Nation's income today. We can be thankful that our tobacco farmers are receiving a fair price for their tobacco—in fact, the best price in all history.

Why should we change the program and endanger the farmers' prices by lowering supports? Even with present good prices, the tobacco farmers' share in the end price of their products is less than 15 percent, as my colleague has pointed out.

I say flatly to this body and to the farmers of Kentucky, that I will not support this proposed change, which has been submitted by the Secretary of Agriculture. It would endanger prices to the tobacco growers, in Kentucky and the rest of the Nation. On the contrary, I will oppose it to the very end.

I now suggest two courses of action. First, I have written the President of the United States, and the Secretary of Agriculture, pointing out the facts which my colleague from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] has so well stated today, and which I stated last August. I ask that all our colleagues from the tobacco growing States do likewise.

Second, the final battleground is in the Congress. I have not the slightest doubt that the Committees on Agriculture in both Houses, and the Congress itself, will defeat this proposal. I am certain that the Congress will not adopt the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture that he be given authority to reduce the price of tobacco to some unknown figure between 60 and 90 percent of parity, or that we abandon the present program, including fixed supports at 90 percent of parity, which has been in existence for a long time, and certainly on a fixed basis since 1948.

I have a high personal regard for the Secretary. He has done much to encourage increased exports of farm products, in supporting Public Law 480, and in developing and proposing the soil bank and other programs designed to meet the problem of surpluses. These programs have done much to reduce the mountain of surplus supplies of many crops. The Secretary has also done much to develop the interest of farmers in active programs to solve their own problems—and I believe this is one of his best achievements.

But he is wrong about the tobacco program.

The tobacco farmers have solved, as well as any group can, their farm problem. They support the present tobacco program.

To the full extent of the ability of those who represent tobacco growers, I am sure we will fight before the committees of the Congress, in the Congress itself, and wherever necessary, to maintain the present tobacco program, and to maintain price supports for tobacco at 90 percent of parity. And I believe that our present tobacco program, and fixed 90-percent support prices, will remain the law.

Again, I compliment my colleague, the junior Senator from Kentucky, for his very fine statement on this subject.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that this is the 76th anniversary of the birth of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I do not believe that anyone of our generation can ever forget the stirring times of the Roosevelt administration. He came into office in one of the most discouraging periods of our history, and he brought to that office an unconquerable will and determination and vision which reinvigorated the flagging spirit of our country.

President Roosevelt was a controversial figure, and we must leave it to history to resolve the controversies. But his boldness, his daring, his imagination, and his qualities of leadership must be conceded by all.

He came to us at a moment in history when we needed all those qualities desperately, and, Mr. President, he will never be forgotten.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to state that on Monday next, February 3, after the conclusion of the morning hour and after the hour of 1 o'clock, I shall seek recognition from the Chair to speak on what I believe to be the urgent necessity for renewing the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in a meaningful form, and the necessity for our Government's joining the Organization for Trade Cooperation.

Now, Mr. President, unless there are other Senators who seek recognition during the morning hour, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there further morning business?

COPPER PRICES AND COPPER PRODUCTION

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, S. 2998, of which I am a cosponsor, and which has been referred to the Senate Committee on Finance, is a bill to raise the peril-point price on copper from 24 to 30 cents per pound, and the tariff to be applied at that point from 2 to 4 cents per pound.

Since the United States has abandoned the constitutional concept of protecting the industries in America, the peril-point approach has been the only means available for the protection of this large and important segment of our economy.

This protection is important not only to the economy of the State of Arizona and other Western States that mine copper, but it has vastly greater priority when we consider the individuals who depend upon copper for their livelihood. Some 16,000 men work in Arizona copper pits, mines, smelters, and mills, and their annual earnings approach \$90 million. The drop in income, because of decreased production in just the last 4 months, approaches \$12 million. This is due entirely to foreign cheap-labor competition.

When one considers that this important American industry is producing copper by labor paid \$2.40 an hour on an average in competition with copper produced, for example, in Rhodesia at a monthly wage of \$16.50, the need for this legislation becomes immediately apparent. It is noble for the United States to attempt to raise the living standards of the rest of the world, but I suggest to my colleagues that the nobility of this approach is dulled greatly if we at the same time decrease the living standards of our own American citizens who work in these mines. Protection for this industry is needed, and is needed badly, in view of the growing competition from cheap labor sources in foreign countries, and I solicit the aid of my friends in this body to seek the prompt enactment of the proposed legislation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a page from the January 1958 issue of Arizona Progress entitled "Value of Ari-

zona's Mining Output Down, Due to Decline in Metal Prices."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VALUE OF ARIZONA'S MINING OUTPUT DOWN, DUE TO DECLINE IN METAL PRICES

Arizona's mining industry suffered a hard blow from declining prices during 1957 even though actual production totals were above last year's all-time high.

As it has every year since 1910, Arizona's 1957 copper production ranked first in the United States—accounting for over 47 percent of the domestic total. However, 1957's total production of 510,000 tons had a gross value of approximately \$301 million while the 1956 total production of 505,908 tons was valued at \$430 million. As one might ask, "What happened?" The answer, of course, is that a decline in copper prices from an average of 41.8 cents per pound in 1956 to 29.5 cents per pound during 1957 automatically wiped out approximately \$129 million in gross income.

Production totals of other principal metals in 1957 also exceeded the previous year's figures. Total value of lead, zinc, gold, and silver produced—despite price declines in lead and zinc prices—exceeded 1956 totals by approximately \$400,000.

Arizona mineral production for 1957, including all reported metals and nonmetals, amounted to approximately \$352 million compared with the 1956 record high of over \$479 million. The nonmetals (primarily sand and gravel, stone, lime, and cement) accounted for approximately \$21 million during 1956 and about the same total has been estimated for 1957.

In the past 10 years, Arizona mines have produced over \$2½ billion worth of the 5 principal metals listed in the tabulation below. Copper production accounted for more than 90 percent of the total, adding further emphasis to Arizona's designation as the Copper State.

Particularly at this time it may be of interest to review the history of metal prices over the past decade. The price of copper just about doubled between 1947 and 1956, then dropped to 29.5 cents per pound in 1957. Currently, copper is selling for about 25 cents per pound. Price trends of other metals, excluding the price of gold which has remained unchanged throughout the period at \$35 per ounce, have been as follows:

Average prices of principal metals [In cents per pound]

Year	Copper	Silver	Lead	Zinc
1947.....	21.0	90.5	14.4	12.1
1948.....	21.7	90.5	17.9	13.3
1949.....	19.7	90.5	15.8	12.4
1950.....	20.8	90.5	13.5	14.2
1951.....	24.2	90.5	17.3	18.2
1952.....	24.2	90.5	16.1	16.6
1953.....	28.7	90.5	13.1	11.5
1954.....	29.7	90.5	13.6	11.1
1955.....	37.6	90.5	15.1	12.3
1956.....	41.8	90.5	16.0	13.5
1957.....	29.5	90.5	14.6	11.4

10-year record of principal metals produced in Arizona

Year	Copper	Gold	Silver	Lead	Zinc	Total
1948.....	\$162,803,000	\$3,832,000	\$4,378,000	\$10,704,000	\$14,491,000	\$196,208,000
1949.....	141,450,000	3,815,000	4,499,000	10,607,000	17,523,000	177,894,000
1950.....	167,773,000	4,141,000	4,820,000	7,123,000	17,176,000	201,033,000
1951.....	201,281,000	4,063,000	4,635,000	6,018,000	19,292,000	235,289,000
1952.....	191,528,000	3,932,000	4,255,000	5,319,000	15,651,000	220,685,000
1953.....	225,883,000	3,949,000	3,938,000	2,470,000	6,332,000	242,572,000
1954.....	224,829,000	3,973,000	3,923,000	2,421,000	4,828,000	239,974,000
1955.....	338,762,000	4,467,000	4,194,000	2,925,000	5,589,000	355,928,000
1956.....	430,022,000	5,114,000	4,687,000	3,768,000	7,009,000	450,600,000
1957.....	300,900,000	5,250,000	4,706,000	3,738,000	7,296,000	321,890,000
Total.....	2,385,231,000	42,536,000	44,035,000	55,093,000	115,178,000	2,642,073,000

DEVELOPMENT OF CERTAIN INSTALLATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL SECURITY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9739) to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish and develop certain installations for the national security, and to confer certain authority on the Secretary of Defense, and for other purposes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] wishes to introduce a bill, and may wish to make some remarks about it, but that he has been temporarily called from the floor. I shall proceed with the understanding that I may yield to him when he returns.

The bill (H. R. 9739) is a supplemental construction authorization bill, pertaining to the Air Force only, for the fiscal year 1958, and relates to military construction, a part of which was authorized during the last session. The reason given for the urgency of this supplemental authorization bill is to take advantage of the 1958 construction season, and thus save 1 year's time. As it passed the House, the bill contained an authorization for \$549,670,000. No changes in this figure have been made by the Committee on Armed Services. Broken down into major categories, the bill contains the following: \$29,670,000 for SAGE, the semiautomatic ground environment system; \$189 million for a ballistic missile detection system; \$112,400,000 for ballistic missiles; \$218,600,000 for alert and dispersal facilities for the Strategic Air Command.

The committee adopts the dollar figures in the bill without change, but is recommending two major changes in the House-passed bill, which I shall cover shortly.

Inasmuch as the detailed testimony on the bill was mostly classified, we do not as yet have printed hearings available. However, the committee hopes to be able to answer any questions which may arise. We have on the floor of the Senate type-written copies of the hearings, and they will be available to any Senator who may desire to look at them.

Actually, this is purely a construction bill. By far the greater majority of all the items in it are of a repetitive nature, such as parking aprons, utilities, and other operational facilities which are generally found in all construction bills. The committee report covers these items in more detail. I shall not ask that it be printed in the Record, because it is a little long. It covers the entire bill, and I refer any interested Senator particularly to the report.

I shall now discuss some of the items contained in the committee report.

SAGE, as we know, is a part of the air defense system. It provides the detection, warning, and identification primarily for aircraft. It gathers and collates the information and reduces it in a semiautomatic manner to usable form. On the basis of this informa-

tion, our defense system is given its proper commands.

The \$29 million in the bill for SAGE is but a continuation of the previously approved program. The ballistic missile detection system is brandnew. It is in addition to the SAGE system of detection which is for aircraft. The \$189 million will provide funds for facilities at three sites, the location of which is as yet classified. In substance, these will be three huge radar sites designed to detect and track enemy ballistic missiles.

Detection systems are very expensive. This is the beginning of a new detection system. I was surprised that more than \$189 million is not necessary. I thought more than that sum would be necessary, even at the start. But I hope the relatively smaller figure is a good omen and that we will find that this system, even though it is highly important, and perhaps will become the most important system, will not be so expensive as some of the others.

The \$112 million in the bill for ballistic missiles adds to the two Atlas sites previously authorized, one at Camp Cooke, Calif., and one at Cheyenne, Wyo. Another site is as yet unlocated. This amount, as I say, is for sites for the Atlas intercontinental ballistic missiles, and is a sum additional to those previously authorized.

The \$218,600,000 for alert and dispersal facilities is to continue the current dispersal program and to provide facilities designed to enable the Strategic Air Command bomber force to react within 15 minutes after an alert. That is a rather expensive undertaking, simple though it may seem, because considerable additional facilities are required to have the B-52 bombers and the others which are a part of the Strategic Air Command together with the personnel who man them, on such an alert basis as to be able to act within 15 minutes, should they receive a command to move. When it is referred to as being able to move within 15 minutes, that means that at least one-third of the bombers in the striking part of the Strategic Air Command would be able to move in battle formation, in battle array, and ready for the ultimate, all within 15 minutes.

Mr. President, the two major changes to which I have previously referred I shall now state.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIER in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I desire to comment on the bill the Senator from Mississippi is discussing.

I believe that the subcommittee headed by him, and of which he and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] are members, has made a very careful study of the proposed construction of military bases and, in addition, has made a wise decision in eliminating section 7—which was included by the House of Representatives—because that section is not appropriate to this bill. I believe

that at the same time the subcommittee was wise in allowing a little leeway to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in connection with the selection of the bases, because so short a time has been available for the making of the decisions as to specific bases.

Thus it is, Mr. President, that I desire to commend the chairman and the other members of the subcommittee for their thoughtful and careful work.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on behalf of the subcommittee, let me say that we certainly appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts; and we also appreciate his study and the suggestions he has made to us, and also in the full committee, in regard to this military construction bill. We always value his opinions; and usually we find that they are sound, and usually they are followed.

Mr. President, in continuing my remarks in regard to the highlights of the bill under consideration, I desire to point out that the two major changes to which I have referred are as follows:

The first pertains to the dispersal program. Although the committee recommends approval of the authorization requested, it questioned the method of dispersal or, to be more specific, it questioned whether the selection of certain sites provides true dispersal. For an explanation of this point, I invite attention to page 9 of the report, which explains the committee's reasoning.

In that connection, Mr. President, I may say that the bill, as originally introduced in the House of Representatives, merely authorized a lump-sum appropriation for the additional construction which would be necessary for this dispersal program—that is to say, the program for the dispersal of these big bombers, so as to arrange them in smaller units and to disperse them in various installations over the country. The House of Representatives objected to the proposed authorization of a lump-sum appropriation, and called for a designation as to where the bases were to be located. As the subcommittee understood, only 3 or 4 days were available for the making of the selections. Provision for them was written into the bill; but, upon further examination, it appeared that the proposed arrangement did not provide for as true a dispersal as could have been provided for; by avoiding certain hazards, others were created.

Therefore, we decided, and the bill as reported by us now provides, that the dispersal of these bases is authorized, but that the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary will take another look, and then will certify as to the bases they select. If they are not the same as the seven provided for in the bill, then the bill authorizes the use for that purpose of these additionally selected sites.

Mr. President, when the bill was considered in the House of Representatives, a floor amendment was offered and accepted. That amendment became section 7 of the House-passed bill. That section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish an Advanced Research Projects Agency, and would authorize the Secretary to enter into necessary contracts. The subcommittee received testimony from representatives

from Secretary McElroy's office; and, after a careful study of all facts concerned, the subcommittee deleted this entire section from H. R. 9739. This is explained on page 10 of the report. While the reasons are set out in the report, I shall summarize them now: Apparently, the House added this section to the construction bill because doubt existed as to whether the Secretary of Defense had, under existing law, such authority to establish an Advanced Research Projects Agency. The subcommittee deleted section 7 without specifically addressing itself to this doubt. Our action was based, rather, on the belief that this is a reorganization matter, is not germane to a construction bill, and that the subject encompasses the entire area of outer space, satellite programs, and rocket-propulsion systems, as well as many other matters.

We felt that any legislation of this nature should be directed to the subject alone and perhaps packaged in a bill designed to amend the National Security Act of 1947, as amended. The committee feels that the subject is so important that legislation should not be enacted hastily without all witnesses concerned having been heard and sufficient time allowed for a thorough and complete study.

Mr. President, the committee recommends that H. R. 9739 be passed as reported, with one additional minor amendment, which is in the nature of a committee amendment, designed to simply make more clear the intent of the bill as it pertains to previous authorizations for dispersal bases. This amendment, on page 10, line 24, deletes the word "funds" and substitutes the word "authorizations", which was the committee's original intent.

Mr. President, the committee unanimously recommends passage of this bill.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. First, I should like to commend the chairman of the subcommittee for the fine job he has done in handling this bill, as well as my colleague on the committee, the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. The report is unanimous. The report itself, I think, tells the story quite well.

I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the committee with reference to dispersal. The truth is, as mentioned in the report, the Soviet stockpile of atomic and hydrogen weapons is growing. The Soviet means of delivery likewise is growing. That means we need more bases, in order to avoid annihilation of the means by which we could retaliate.

I also associate myself completely with the comments of the chairman of the subcommittee with regard to that matter.

Secondly, I should like to mention that in the report we have stressed that bids for construction work—at least work which is to be undertaken in the United States and on the North American Continent—should be awarded by

competitive bidding, unless there is a national emergency which would preclude that possibility. I think this is important. We are dealing with billions of dollars in connection with current defense programs, and with programs yet to be authorized.

A third observation I should like to make, Mr. President, is that the American people should realize that this is only the beginning of a very large defense authorization program that will have to be presented to the Congress. This being a supplemental authorization, it is only part of the program which will be presented to the Congress at this session.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Washington very much for his remarks. I wish especially to thank him and the Senator from South Dakota for their very timely and valuable assistance. Their assistance is always valuable in getting together on matters which are embraced in this rather far-reaching bill. They do excellent work. They are familiar with the subject, and they go about their work in the very finest spirit and attitude, and they are quite helpful. The Senate owes them a debt of gratitude.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I wish to congratulate the able Senator from Mississippi for the expeditious way in which he and his committee have handled this proposed legislation.

Mr. STENNIS. We thank the Senator.

Mr. GORE. Is it the Senator's opinion that an appropriation bill to provide the funds herein authorized will follow very quickly?

Mr. STENNIS. That appropriation bill is now being considered by the Senate Appropriations Committee. Hearings have been held on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of this week, and perhaps the bill will be marked up tomorrow.

Mr. GORE. Then, by next week we should actually pass the appropriation bill and send to the President both the authorization and the supplemental appropriation he has requested for the fiscal year 1958, should we not?

Mr. STENNIS. Without a doubt.

Mr. GORE. That situation illustrates why I feel that the able Senator from Mississippi and his colleagues on the committee are entitled to appreciation and congratulations for their expeditious consideration of this vital bill.

Mr. STENNIS. We thank the Senator from Tennessee, who is always very helpful to us in every way.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I feel I must indicate, however, that this is but a small beginning of the programs of action necessary to maintain America's superiority in the military, scientific, and economic fields.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, the Senator is correct; and I think it would be very well indeed if Congress and the Ameri-

can people were warned and advised of that fact. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and other Senators who have worked diligently on this matter. I do not question any of the decisions, reports, or recommendations they have made, but I wish to bring out one point. I gathered, from what the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Tennessee, who preceded me, have said, that this is just the beginning of a large program for expansion of our defense facilities. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Mississippi if consideration has been given or will be given to utilizing installations that have been deactivated or which it is contemplated will be deactivated in future years. It seems to me we in the Senate are obligated to making prudent expenditures on behalf of the people. Installations throughout the United States have been deactivated. It is certainly to be hoped that consideration will be given to reactivating such installations, rather than building new installations. I should be glad to get a statement from the Senator from Mississippi on that question.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Kansas has made a very good suggestion, indeed. I can assure the Senator the committee feels as he does about utilizing installations which already exist. We have encouraged the different departments to follow that policy, and they have given some evidence, in addition to their expressions, of following such a course. I think we should not only utilize facilities already constructed, but, in operating those bases, should utilize, so far as we can, the services of the local communities and economies, and utilize local housing and other facilities that fit in with the military operations, because it is the civilians who are paying the taxes and carrying the burden of the cost of the defense program. Of course, the military personnel pay part of the taxes, but it is the economy of the country as a whole that will have to foot the bill. The dispersal program is going to use existing bases. The missile detection program involves new installations at remote places. Perhaps two of the missile launching bases will have to be new, but, obviously, that involves a geographic consideration.

I shall shortly yield the floor to the Senator from South Dakota, who, I hope, will be prepared to make some remarks, but I should like to emphasize, if I may, the point raised by the Senator from Washington with reference to construction projects on the North American continent being let by competitive bids, if at all possible. I wish to emphasize, as I think all members of the subcommittee do, our strong belief in that principle. We would have recommended that the policy be written into the body of the bill, except that such a strict provision might lead to complications which might lead to delay in some of the north-

ern installations where the time during which construction may take place is quite short. So we did not put the language in the bill, but wrote out the policy in the strongest possible language. We stated that unless it was contrary to national security we certainly expected these contracts would be entered into only on a competitive bid basis, and awarded to the lowest responsible bidder.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD at this point the paragraph at the bottom of page 8 of the committee report, beginning with the words "The committee concurs," as well as the paragraph beginning "Section 5." To further designate the material, it is under the heading "Ballistic Missile Detection System—\$189,000,000."

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**BALLISTIC-MISSILE DETECTION SYSTEM
(\$180 MILLION)**

The committee concurs and recommends approval. However, because of the committee's knowledge of past contracting experience with reference to the construction of DEW line facilities in the extreme northern portions of the North American Continent (and it can reasonably be expected that any construction of ballistic missile detection sites in similar areas will have like problems), the committee is of the firm belief that any construction contracts entered into should be awarded on a competitive bid basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

Section 5 of the bill stipulates that contracts made by the United States under this act shall be awarded insofar as practicable in this manner. In recommending this legislation, it is the intent of the committee that unless the national security will be impaired, the award of contracts for construction of ballistic missile detection sites on the North American Continent shall be made on a competitive bid basis to the lowest responsible bidder. The committee believes this action is not inconsistent with previous policy nor that currently in vogue in the Department of the Air Force. In taking testimony on the subject, the Air Force stated:

It is the policy of the United States Air Force to award contracts for military construction on a competitive lump-sum basis to the maximum extent practicable. Deviations from such procedure are made only when definite extenuating circumstances indicate that it is in the best interest of the United States Government. Construction is performed for the United States Air Force by numerous construction agencies, including Corps of Engineers of the Department of the Army; Bureau of Yards and Docks of the Department of the Navy; various foreign governments, such as the United Kingdom, France, and others; and subordinate Air Force commands both in and outside of the United States. In accordance with section 505 of Public Law 85-241, the Secretaries of the military departments shall report semi-annually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder. The initial report in accordance with this law is now being compiled covering the first half of fiscal year 1958 and will be submitted to the Congress on March 31, 1958. A preliminary report indicates that between 94 and 97 percent of the value of all contracts awarded by the United States Air Force for military construction are on a competitive lump-sum basis.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield the floor, with the hope

that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] will have some remarks to make.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. Before I yield the floor, I am happy to yield to the Senator from Michigan for a question.

Mr. POTTER. I am sorry I was not able to hear the first part of the Senator's speech, and possibly he has covered in his remarks the point I have in mind. To accomplish dispersal of SAC and the work which is to be done, what items are to be included?

Mr. STENNIS. The primary item is for additional runways for the heavy bombers. There are also some additional aprons, places on the side, and the special facilities nearby for the crews, so that they may be kept in readiness. There are also some special dispensations to keep the bombers themselves in special readiness.

Mr. POTTER. Would there be involved an addition in personnel at the various bases?

Mr. STENNIS. The program will call for some special personnel, yes, assigned for the additional movements which will be necessary to keep everything warmed up, so to speak. As to needed operating personnel, after the bomber actually gets off the ground, that probably would be much the same. I think it would not involve much additional personnel. I do not know how much is involved per bomber.

Mr. POTTER. I wish to commend the Senator from Mississippi for the expeditious manner in which the committee has handled the problem. I think for the sake of national security and defense, what is proposed is something that has to be done, and it should be done as quickly as possible. I wish to commend the junior Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his unusual interest.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, the chairman of the subcommittee, has made a good statement covering the purposes of the bill. I shall not take the time of the Senate to comment upon the provisions relating to the funds therein proposed. Because, however, the question of the assignment of new duties to the Defense Department, or within the Defense Department, and possibly to other agencies of the Government, is involved in the matter which was treated by section 7 of the bill as passed by the House, I wish to make some remarks upon that subject.

Section 7, as included by the House of Representatives, would place statutory authority behind the present proposal of the Secretary of Defense to create within the Department of Defense a new agency to be known as the Advanced Research Projects Agency.

The Secretary of Defense is acting under the general authority contained in the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, which in section 202 (b) states:

The Secretary of Defense shall be the principal assistant to the President in all matters relating to the Department of Defense. Un-

der the direction of the President, and subject to the provisions of this act, he shall have direction, authority, and control over the Department of Defense.

That broad language, that the Secretary "shall have direction, authority, and control over the Department of Defense," is the general language upon which the Secretary of Defense relies in creating the new agency.

In the discussion attendant upon the adoption of the National Security Act of 1947 and the National Security Act Amendments of 1949 a great deal of concern was expressed by Members of Congress that the Secretary might take away from some of the functions intended to be carried on by the Secretary of the Air Force for the Department of the Air Force, by the Secretary of the Navy for the Department of the Navy, or by the Secretary of the Army for the Department of the Army. Consequently, in the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, there were written in specific limitations upon the power of the Secretary of Defense. For the purposes of the RECORD I wish to read them at this time. They are shown in section 202 (c):

(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the combatant functions assigned to the military services by sections 205 (e), 206 (b), 206 (c), and 208 (f) hereof shall not be transferred, reassigned, abolished, or consolidated.

(2) Military personnel shall not be so detailed or assigned as to impair such combatant functions.

(3) The Secretary of Defense shall not direct the use and expenditure of funds of the Department of Defense in such manner as to effect the results prohibited by paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection.

Those provisions have been generally interpreted as limitations upon the power of the Secretary of Defense, and would prohibit him from creating a new fourth department within the Department of Defense. For example, perhaps one which might be created would be the Department of Space—or the department of anything else.

However, under the existing situation, where we have been thrust so rapidly into the space era, the Secretary of Defense feels, and I think that the members of the subcommittee agree, that he has the responsibility of providing for advanced research projects which would discharge the responsibility of the Department of Defense with regard to the security of the country.

It would be desirable normally, if we had ample time, I think, for the Congress to have extended hearings regarding the creation of any new agency dealing with research, particularly in the field of astronautics.

The appropriation bill which is presently pending before the Senate Committee on Appropriations carries an allocation of money designed to be available for the new agency which the Secretary of Defense is creating by a directive within that Department.

The chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, recognizing that in the House of Representatives strict observance is generally given to the rule which prevents legislation being carried

in an appropriation bill, took the position that there should be legislation in the military construction bill as it was presented before the House of Representatives, in order that that could be pointed to as authorizing legislation, to guard the funds in the appropriation bill from being subject to a point of order. The point of order which could have been made in the House of Representatives, without legislation, would have been that the appropriation proposed to create powers or to create an agency which was not authorized by law.

The language inserted by section 7 in the amendment placed in the bill by the House served a useful purpose, in that it afforded protection for the appropriation against a point of order. But, as the chairman of our subcommittee has so aptly said, a military construction bill is not exactly the proper vehicle for the presentation to the Senate of a provision in law dealing with organization within the Defense Department.

I think the Senator from Mississippi feels, and I feel—and I believe the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson] joins us in that belief—that if we are to have a new agency created, with specific powers, or with broad powers dealing with the field of astronautics and research projects in the States, it should be the result of extended hearings by the appropriate committees of the Congress; that the field should be pretty well defined; and that the purposes of the new agency should be pretty well set forth.

When Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1953 became effective in June 1953, there was a section of that plan which related to research and development for the Department of Defense. It has been incorporated in the United States Code, title 10, as Public Law 1028 of the 84th Congress. The section relating to research and development is identified as section 2351, and is headed Policy, Plans, and Coordination. It reads as follows:

The Secretary of Defense shall keep informed on the status of scientific research relating to the national security, and shall make adequate provision for research and development on scientific problems relating to the national security. He shall—

- (1) Prepare a complete and integrated program of research and development for military purposes;
- (2) Keep informed on trends in scientific research relating to the national security and the measures necessary to assure continued and increasing progress;
- (3) Coordinate research and development among the military departments and allocate responsibility for specific programs among those departments;

It is subparagraph 3 which has been thought by many to relate to responsibilities of the Secretary in connection with the establishment of a new agency dealing with space problems. I read it again, therefore, and I shall wish to comment on it very briefly.

The Secretary shall—

- (3) Coordinate research and development among the military departments and allocate responsibility for specific programs among those departments.

Note that the language of the law is "among the military departments and allocate responsibility for specific programs among those departments."

The thought has been expressed to the committee that the language "coordinate research and development among the military departments and allocate responsibility for specific programs among those departments" serves as a limitation against the Secretary's creating a new department or agency to which to assign responsibilities in research and development. It provides that the Secretary shall coordinate and assign responsibility among existing departments.

The reorganization plan continues with two other paragraphs, as follows:

- (4) Formulate policy for the Department of Defense on research and development involving agencies outside the Department of Defense; and
- (5) Consider the interaction of research and development and strategy and instruct the Joint Chiefs of Staff thereon.

In the discussion of the program which was placed before the committee we were advised that the Office of the Secretary of Defense proposed that the agency should direct and manage such defense projects in the field of research and development as the Secretary of Defense shall from time to time designate, by individual projects or by category, as directed by act of Congress.

The agency—meaning the new agency created by the Secretary—would be authorized to direct research and development work in the fields as assigned, and to arrange for the performance of work by other agencies of Government, including the military departments.

The agency must also enter into contracts with private business entities or educational or research institutions, within the limits of assigned funds when appropriate, and may establish laboratory facilities upon recommendation by the Director and approval by the Secretary of Defense.

The provision that the agency might establish laboratory facilities obviously contemplates the possibility of acquisition of real estate, entering into contracts for construction, and other things which go along with the establishment of laboratory facilities.

I am not speaking for other members of the committee in this connection, but so far as I am personally concerned, I can find no authority in existing law for the creation by the Secretary of Defense of a new agency, within the department, which can enter into contracts for the establishment of laboratories, except as it might be done through one of the existing departments—the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force.

However, as I stated earlier, the committee believed, individually and collectively, that the Secretary of Defense had a responsibility to meet the situation which now exists in the possibility of astronautics and other projects of a research character which bear upon the security of the country. Therefore we wished to do nothing which would interpose any difficulty in the way of his proceeding promptly along the lines presently indicated.

We consulted the Comptroller General with regard to the authority of the Secretary of Defense to enter into contracts directly or through a new agency, and

outside the existing departments. The Comptroller has advised the committee, and has advised the Department of Defense, that if the Congress makes the appropriation contemplated in the appropriation bill now pending, and does so after the agency has been created within the Department, that will be interpreted as recognition by the Congress of the agency; and the appropriation of funds, without the interposition of any point of order, would establish the authority for the expenditure of funds, provided that no part of the language in the appropriation bill which would seem to compromise that authority.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has a letter from the Comptroller General in which a suggestion is made with respect to the deletion of certain words in the appropriation bill. If he will contribute that letter for the RECORD at this time, I think it will be most constructive.

I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of the remarks of the Senator from South Dakota a letter addressed to Hon. CARL HAYDEN, chairman, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, from Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General of the United States. The letter is dated January 29, 1958.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF
THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, January 29, 1958.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you know, H. R. 10146, making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense, is now pending before your committee, and carries an item for the Advanced Research Projects Agency.

On the assumption that if such item is enacted into law it is the intention of the Congress that the agency proceed with its program, to the extent of funds made available, we recommend that the words "as may be authorized by law" be deleted from this item. In that event, we would regard the appropriation of funds to the Agency as a recognition by the Congress of the legal status of the agency. If the words are permitted to remain in the bill some question might be raised as to the status or authority of the Advanced Research Projects Agency and, conceivably, the purpose of the Congress, in enacting the appropriation, could be defeated.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In that letter the Comptroller General states that if the words "as may be authorized by law" were deleted from the item in the bill as it was sent over from the House, the appropriation of funds to the agency would be a recognition by Congress of the legal status of the agency.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I appreciate the contribution made by the Senator from Massachu-

setts. Let me add, for the clarification of the situation for the benefit of Senators who have not had the opportunity to read the letter, that when the Comptroller General refers to the deletion of certain language—meaning the words “as may be authorized by law”—he refers to the deletion or recommended deletion of those words from the appropriation bill, and not from the bill now pending.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The inclusion of the words “as may be authorized by law” in the appropriation bill could have been construed as a limitation on the expenditure of money, which would have required the Department of Defense or the Comptroller General to go back into the law to find the specific authorizations for which the money might be expended. As I understand, the deletion of the language referred to means that the money is being appropriated to the Agency which has heretofore been created, and consequently will constitute approval by the Congress of the appropriation to that agency.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes; that is correct. As I understand, with the agency set forth in the last paragraph of the appropriation bill, the Secretary of Defense must set up the agency to be created, and with those words deleted, the appropriation is in order.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Senator, because I think his statement makes a valuable contribution and will certainly support the Attorney General in approving expenditures from that fund. It confirms the position taken by the subcommittee with reference to the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I should like to ask the Senator a question so that this point will be clearly understood. As the Senator from Mississippi now understands, the Attorney General has said that by deleting the words “as may be authorized by law” from the appropriation bill, any sums appropriated in the appropriation bill could be legally expended without any additional statutory enactment. Is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my understanding. The fact that Congress makes an appropriation to an agency, and that agency is named in the appropriation bill, indicates that Congress thereby recognizes that the agency is properly in existence.

Mr. STENNIS. I have this additional question. The Senator says that the agency must be set up before the appropriation bill becomes law. Is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. But the agency has not been actually established, as I understand.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Secretary of Defense told the committee yesterday morning that he had been holding up the creation of the agency until he had the proper man to put in it. However, with the understanding of the law as it has been now stated, he said he would create

the agency and then wait to get the proper man.

Mr. STENNIS. In other words, he would create the agency prior to the appropriation bill becoming law. Is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank both Senators.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I believe the record is clear that if the appropriation is made subsequent to the creation of the agency, Congress, by the final approval of the appropriation, will have placed its stamp of approval upon the creation of the agency, and thereby approved the expenditure of funds for the purposes set forth.

I wish to say, however, in conclusion, that I believe that the area of astronautics is so broad that Congress may address itself to the whole field. The Secretary of Defense would be severely criticized were he not to accept his responsibilities in the security field at this time. However, the possibilities in the field of astronautics are not limited to the Department of Defense. There are research projects which have possibilities in weather detection, weather forecasting, and possibly in weather control, and which might not be encompassed by a project which would be directed by the Secretary of Defense in the name of security, or the development of weapons. There are projects which are related to communications and the development of resources, and possibly the field of exploration of other planets and outer space, which might or might not come within the purview of weapons development.

Therefore I believe that Congress should at an early date address itself to the broad program of research into space projects of various kinds; and I hope that before long legislation will be before Congress which will provide the vehicle for hearings on those subjects.

In closing I wish to express my appreciation to the chairman of the committee and to the Senator from Washington. It has been an inspiration to work with them because of their knowledge in this field, and because of the devoted and patriotic spirit which animates their thoughts and activities. I also wish to express my appreciation—and I am sure the other members of the committee will wish to join me—to the committee clerk, Col. Kenneth E. BeLieu, who has been most helpful to us in the consideration of the bill.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I should like to make a few undramatic suggestions on some down-to-earth defense needs. I want to stress the things we need to do immediately to stay alive.

In a subsequent speech I shall discuss the parallel efforts we should make to speed advanced weapons projects and other long-range programs that may win us the race to the stars. But first things first. There are some things we have to do on earth in 1958 if we are to go to the moon in 1968.

My remarks today will take the form of a series of constructive recommendations. This is in accord with the policy I have tried to follow over the years in

pointing out deficiencies in our defense program and in proposing remedies.

History may prove that some of the steps I am suggesting were unnecessary. But we cannot await the verdict of history. Gone are our two precious allies in past wars—time in which to mobilize, and distance to protect our homeland. Today, whatever force is required, either to deter war or to win it if deterrence fails, must be on hand—ready at all times. No longer can we afford the luxury of second guessing our requirements. In the missile age, it is the first guess that counts.

The aggressor will always have one grave advantage over us. He can prepare to strike when he wants, where he wants, and how he wants. We have to prepare to meet aggression in many different forms, and not at times or places of our own choosing.

Mr. President, what are we now failing to do that we should be doing—in the air, at sea, and on land?

In particular, I want to make the following seven recommendations:

First. We should produce more B-52 heavy bombers and KC-135 tankers, faster.

The Russians are at present well ahead of us in the ICBM-ICBM race. The Soviet missile program has proceeded much faster than we expected 3 years ago. Our own missile program has proceeded more slowly than was expected. More Soviet missiles sooner. Fewer American missiles later. This is the fact and the outlook before us.

The one and only way to fill the gap is by more long-range manned bombers. Ultimately manned bombers will supplement ballistic missiles, but they cannot supplement missiles which we do not have.

This year, next year, and the year thereafter, we must work with what we have in hand. This is the B-52, and the KC-135 tanker that keeps it airborne.

The B-52 is now the world's most advanced operational long-range bombing plane. In its existing version, and in its advanced version—the B-52G—this plane must and will be the mainstay of our retaliatory force for the critical years ahead.

Yet in the face of this fact, what have we done? Incredible as it seems, we have been cutting back and stretching out our programs, when every day that passes urgently calls for more B-52's, sooner. The fact is we still have as many wings of the obsolete B-36 as we have of B-52's, while our medium-range bomber, the B-47, becomes more obsolescent every day.

The record contains impressive and uncontradicted evidence that our position in manned bombers is seriously deficient.

In 1956 General LeMay, then commander in chief of the Strategic Air Command, testified that—

Under current intelligence estimates and approved plans and programs the Soviet long-range air force will be relatively stronger than the Strategic Air Command by 1960 at the latest.

General LeMay went on to say:

If present plans and programs, as I understand them, are unchanged and our estimates of Russian airpower are correct, I think there is grave doubt that the Strategic Air Command would present an effective deterrence in that time period (1958-60).

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has stated that the Russians are at present well ahead of us in the IRBM-ICBM race. Could the Senator give us some idea as to just how much ahead of us the Russians are at this time in those two fields?

Mr. JACKSON. The Soviets have operational intermediate range ballistic missiles. We do not.

The Soviets probably have some operational intercontinental ballistic missiles. We do not.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator mind explaining the ranges of the IRBM and ICBM?

Mr. JACKSON. The Soviets have intermediate range missiles in the range area of 1,000 nautical miles.

Our specifications for these missiles call for 1,500 miles for IRBM's and 5,000 miles for ICBM's.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator tell us, further, how the IRBM and the ICBM travel?

Mr. JACKSON. The IRBM probably would traverse a distance of 1,500 nautical miles in 13 minutes. At its maximum speed, I believe it reaches about Mach 14 prior to reentering the atmosphere.

The intercontinental ballistic missile can traverse 5,000 miles in about 33 minutes. It probably reaches a maximum speed, prior to reentry into the atmosphere, of Mach 21.

When I use the term Mach, that means the speed of sound.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Do I correctly understand that on the basis of the information which the Senator has just given the Senate, the United States is within 15 minutes of any missile takeoff from the Soviet Union or contiguous territories?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes; the Soviets have that capability, or will have it soon. In addition, the Soviets have a fleet of more than 500 submarines, some of which have missile-firing capability.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Washington has been diligent in this particular field, and more than diligent in pointing out the deficiency which this country suffers in comparison with the Soviet Union so far as submarines are concerned.

On the basis of the startling statement which the Senator has made this afternoon, is it safe to assume that in case of another great emergency, this country would no longer be the privileged sanctuary it was in the first two World Wars?

Mr. JACKSON. Very definitely the No. 1 target of the Soviet Union in an all-out war will be the United States. If the United States is destroyed, all of our allies will fall with it. We will be the No. 1 target in an all-out war.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then, to recapitulate, we are within 15 minutes, on the basis of ICBM speeds, of any missile takeoff from the Soviet Union. We will no longer be a privileged sanctuary in case of another world conflagration. We will no longer have time to mobilize our manpower, gird our industry, and develop our resources. Is that correct?

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct. We have had two fortunate allies in past conflicts—time and space: time to mobilize and space to protect our shores from enemy attack. These two allies, together with the great industrial capability of this country, have made possible our victories in the last two terrible wars.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am very happy to yield to my colleague on the committee, the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have read the speech which is now being delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from Washington. I believe it is a most constructive and carefully prepared presentation regarding our current position in the world today.

No one in the Senate has stressed the importance of this country being prepared against a possible enemy more than has my colleague from the State of Washington.

I notice that in his able and carefully drawn up talk, the Senator quotes from the testimony of General LeMay given in 1956.

Mr. JACKSON. The testimony I have referred to is the testimony given before the subcommittee of which the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri served as chairman, and on which he did such an effective job in pointing up the need for this country to develop effective air power.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator for his comment. He, too, was a member of that committee, and nobody contributed more to its successful operation than he did.

In 1958—in fact, this very month—General LeMay made the following statement in his testimony before the House Committee on Appropriations concerning the fiscal 1958 supplemental defense appropriation bill:

What this all adds up to is that 18 months ago, when we had a real look at the intelligence picture for Mr. SYMINGTON's hearings, we estimated that the combat capability of the Soviet long-range air force would surpass ours by the middle of 1959. I still think that by mid-1959 there is a good chance that their combat capability will exceed ours.

I ask my able colleague from Washington if he does not agree with those remarks, made earlier this month.

Mr. JACKSON. I agree completely with the remarks. They are borne out by what we are doing and by the information which is made available to us from intelligence sources.

I may say that no one knows the picture better than does General LeMay, who headed the Strategic Air Command for so many years. I have complete faith in his military judgment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. General LeMay continued in his testimony before the House Committee on Appropriations:

Yes, they are going to have more ground forces; they are going to have more submarines; it looks like their air capability will be greater than ours. Even so, that is nothing unusual to me. I never had to start a fight with superiority, and I don't think any other soldier of the United States ever has either. We have always failed to prepare properly for wars, and we have always been the underdog going in. I don't think it is very profitable to plan on doing that next time, but if that happens we will do the best we can with what you have given us. . . . I think all the previous testimony here and in the Senate has indicated that the Russian army is bigger than ours. I do not say better; I say bigger. They have more submarines than we have. It is on the record that we expect their striking capability in the air to pass ours some time in 1959. And I do not think we can deny it here, since it has been said on the record before.

I think we probably will be stronger in 1959, but I do not have any assurance we will be strong enough in 1959.

Mr. JACKSON. I may comment at this point that in the missile age underdogs will be dead dogs. There will be no chance to survive unless we have adequate forces in being at the time the conflict breaks out, so as to do the job necessary for survival.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In a statement which was issued by the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Preparedness, on behalf of the rest of the members of the committee and himself, 17 points were brought up as to what should be done now. "Decisive action" was the term used.

I have read carefully the speech of the able Senator from Washington, in which he points out how little is being asked for, not only in the supplemental 1958 budget, but also in the budget for the fiscal year 1959. I know my colleague is aware of the 17 points which have been brought up in the statement issued by the chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee, our majority leader.

May I ask my colleague if he believes that those 17 points recommended for decisive action are in any way taken care of by either the fiscal 1958 supplemental appropriation bill or the proposed 1959 appropriation bill. I said "in any way taken care of"; I should change that to "adequately taken care of."

Mr. JACKSON. Some of the items may be taken care of in part, but certainly the overall 17-point program to which the distinguished Senator from Missouri has referred was not taken care of in any existing request to Congress, to my knowledge.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Washington for yielding to me. This afternoon, as he has done many times before, he has made a real contribution to the future security of our country.

Mr. JACKSON. I appreciate the kind comments of my good friend the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. President, since General LeMay gave his testimony, our manned-bomber programs, far from being increased, have been reduced.

The truth is that the Soviet Union is speedily diminishing our lead in manned airpower and, at current rates, will outdistance this country in the very near future.

And now the budget requests before Congress call for not a single penny for more B-52's, beyond the 11 wings already programed.

General White, Air Force Chief of Staff, recently told Congress:

If we don't get more money, we will be unable to reorder B-52's except at very great expense, because the production line goes to pieces; and I feel that until we know more about these ballistic missiles and until we know about the B-58 we should have the insurance of keeping that line open.

General White went on to say he had "taken every step I know" to obtain an additional \$615 million for another wing of B-52's and for the KC-135 tankers to support them, only to have the Secretary of Defense refuse his request.

Mr. President, I am not sure that the \$615 million is enough. My own belief is that at least \$1 billion could now be profitably budgeted for this purpose. But of this much I am sure: The Air Force request constitutes the irreducible minimum required for our national safety.

Second. We should step up the production schedule for the B-58 medium-weight supersonic bomber.

The B-52—even in the advanced version—by no means represents the last word in manned bombers. Even more advanced manned weapons systems are bound to come. We can be sure of one thing: Moscow is hard at work on new high-performance aircraft.

At present we have one hopeful new plane sufficiently developed to go into production. The possible successor to the B-47—the B-58—exists in prototype; and seven B-58's have been delivered for testing purposes. Currently planned programs bring the total number of B-58's on order to less than 80.

In my view, we can get the new B-58's more rapidly than present plans allow. Recently, when General White was asked whether they are producing the B-58's as rapidly as they could, he replied:

I am sure they are not. It may take some money.

Mr. President, if we tool up faster for the B-58, we shall have more of them sooner. I am hopeful that Congress will promptly budget funds for this purpose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. During the course of the very excellent speech being given by the distinguished Senator from Washington, I did not hear him use the expression "lead time," but I understood him to make indirect references to it. Can he state just what is the difference, as between the United States of America and the Soviet Union, so far as the lead time in the production of both planes and missiles is concerned?

Mr. JACKSON. We know that in the case of the B-52 as compared with the Soviet Bison bomber, the Russians were able to cut their lead time to half as much as ours—in fact, I prefer to call it "leg-time".

I cannot state any precise figures as to the missiles; but I can say that it is quite clear that the Soviets took many calculated risks, made their decisions promptly, and were able to get the jump on us, in connection with the development and production of both the IRBM and the ICBM.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield further to me?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Referring to the production of the B-52 in comparison with the production of the Bison bomber, the Soviet counterpart of the B-52, can the Senator from Washington give an approximate figure, in years, as to how long in the way of lead time it took to develop the B-52, on the one hand, and the Soviet Bison bomber, on the other? Can the Senator give a rough figure as to that?

Mr. JACKSON. My rough guess is that in our case it was about 10 years from the initial development phase to the point of obtaining operational capability.

Mr. MANSFIELD. From the planning boards?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes; compared with 5 years for the Soviets.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If that statement is a correct one—and I assume it is—then it appears to me that by the time the 10 years taken up in our lead time is over and the finished product becomes operational, it also becomes obsolete.

Mr. JACKSON. There is that danger.

It has been clear to many of us for a long time that the Soviets realized that, if they were ever to defeat the United States and the rest of the Free World, they would have to defeat us at our own game. The strength of our position over the years has been our industrial, our scientific, and our technical capability. The Soviets have demonstrated dramatically, with sputnik and with other devices, that they are out to seize our trump card and to beat us at our own game. We have dramatic proof that they have been doing exactly that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I can understand the Senator's point, when he states that in the matter of lead time the Soviet Union is beating us at our own game, because we have always boasted of our industrial know-how and of the fact that we could get things done on a big production basis.

What is the reason for the difference of 5 years—again referring to the B-52's and the Soviet Bison bombers; what is the reason for this 5-year lag behind the Soviet Union, insofar as we are concerned, in view of all the facilities we have at our disposal?

Mr. JACKSON. I think there has been a basic assumption in the United States—one which extends all the way to children who, at the age of 5 or 6,

enter grade school—that we are superior in anything involving industry, science, or technology. If I were to give one, overall reason for our difficulty, it is that we have a national superiority complex.

When it comes to the mass production of anything in the way of industrial goods for domestic consumption or the mass production of arms with which to defend our country, the average American, when asked, "Who can turn out the most?", will reply, "The United States of America." There has been a feeling that the Soviets are only a few years from a feudal society, so how could they ever match the United States of America?

Our difficulty is a national superiority complex. The sooner we learn humility, the stronger the United States and the rest of the Free World will be.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Washington.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. JACKSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. For some years the distinguished Senator from Washington and I have been listening to statements which have attempted to justify our passing over quantitative superiority to the Soviet Union, on the ground that we were qualitatively superior, on the ground, on the sea, and in many respects, in the air. Will not the distinguished Senator from Washington, who has made so thorough a study of this subject, agree that what sputnik did, more than anything else, was to expose the fallacy of the claims of our being qualitatively superior, as a justification for our having passed over quantitative superiority?

Mr. JACKSON. I agree completely with what the distinguished Senator has said. It is quite obvious that if we, with only 8 percent of the world's population, are to maintain a military posture which will assure our survival, we certainly have to overcome the numerical disadvantage, through qualitative superiority. The Soviets realize this; and the Soviets have centered their attack on the very area in which we have maintained supremacy in the past.

In my trip to the Soviet Union in 1956, I found first-hand corroboration of that objective. This is the obvious course for the Soviets to pursue if they wish to win.

Mr. President, I come now to my next point:

Third. We should further expedite the dispersal of our strategic striking force, we should take steps to harden existing bases, and we should redouble our efforts to provide early warning against enemy planes and missiles.

Our Strategic Air Command bases are now the No. 1 target for Soviet attack, because our SAC represents our means of retaliation against Russia. Moreover, as the Kremlin expands its stockpile of nuclear weapons and improves its means of delivering bombs, our bases become more and more vulnerable.

By either this year or next year, our entire system of overseas bases will be exposed to Russian IRBM attack. This year, and even more in the years thereafter, the strategic airbases in our own

country will become exposed to Soviet ICBM assault. Meanwhile, vital bases here at home are now open to enemy missiles from the sea.

Confronting this hazardous prospect, what have we done to disperse our bombers, to protect them on existing bases, and to assure them the earliest possible warning so they can get off the ground before they are hit?

The answer is we have done far too little.

SAC dispersal programs have proceeded at a leisurely pace. We have taken no decisive measures to harden our bases by protecting our bombers from indirect hits. At the present time the retaliatory force on which our safety depends stands on ramps above ground. An H-bomb that misses its target by a wide margin will still wipe out a force that is so exposed. Early warning and detection systems against manned aircraft are far from peak efficiency. Interservice rivalry has kept us sitting on our hands for the past 2 years in developing an early warning system against the ICBM.

New budget requests now before Congress provide for dispersal of SAC at a faster rate and for improvement of our early warning and detection programs. Again, however, I think an insufficient effort is planned.

SAC is the only deterrent, retaliatory force we have on hand. Nothing is more urgent than safeguarding it against destruction or neutralization by surprise attack. Surely, substantial funds to speed this effort are warranted.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is talking about the Strategic Air Command. Is it not a fact that approximately 20 percent of our B-47 takeoffs abort?

Mr. JACKSON. I am not sure of the exact figure, but I know it is quite a large number.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Well, I have been informed that it is the case that 20 percent of the B-47 takeoffs abort, either on the field or immediately after they are airborne, owing to inadequate ground-crew servicing. I understand that with first-rate servicing there would be virtually no such aborted flights, but this servicing by enlisted men is bad simply because 85 percent of those men leave the Strategic Air Command—and it is hard duty—or leave the Air Force entirely, after a hitch which includes 3 years of training.

The reason that they leave the Strategic Air Command, as I understand, after the United States Government expends thousands of dollars on their training—and, so far as triple-rated bomber pilots are concerned, hundreds of thousands of dollars—is to go into private industry to make more money; and it leaves a gap in the security defenses of our country which is extremely hard to fill.

Mr. JACKSON. The distinguished junior Senator from Montana has put his finger on a very important part of this problem. The personnel problem is a crucial one in the Air Force, and particularly in SAC. I understand that

75 percent of the airmen have served in SAC 2 years or less. That is a very serious turnover.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Senator have any information as to whether or not this statement is correct: That something on the order of 200 B-47's are in existence, but we can neither crew nor service them?

Mr. JACKSON. I would not be able to state the exact figure, but it is far too large.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In other words, we have a sizable number of B-47's which have neither crews to man them nor service groups to service them. Is that correct?

Mr. JACKSON. To service or man them properly.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I resume my statement.

Fourth. We should increase the number of operational missiles that will be available by immediately ordering additional IRBM's and ICBM's.

It may be true that we cannot now shorten the time in which we will get our first operational ballistic missiles. Certain irreducible items of technological lead time are working against us.

We can, however, hasten the time at which we will have significant numbers of operational missiles. We can take the calculated risk of going into mass production before every minute item of the missile has been tested.

In the Manhattan project in World War II we constructed production facilities at Hanford without knowing for sure that the facilities could do the job. Had we waited until every phase of the bomb was tested out, our achievement of that decisive weapon would have been long delayed.

Test missiles are fine, but only operational missiles in abundance will pay off as a deterrent.

General Schriever, Commander of the Air Force Ballistic Missile Division, recently said that the capabilities now exist to start building more units of the Thor and Atlas than are in presently approved programs. He said a further stepup in production schedules is possible by using our current production base, with only some rounding out.

I consider wholly inadequate the budget requests now before Congress to accelerate production rates for ballistic missiles. These missiles are supposed to have the highest national priority. If that means anything, it means that we must execute that priority at every stage of their preparation, including production.

Fifth. We should revise upward our program for producing Polaris missile-launching submarines, and lay down a minimum of 15 keels immediately.

I have previously proposed that we build 100 Polaris missile-launching submarines at the earliest possible date. These submarines afford the opportunity to increase radically the effectiveness of our IRBM. After all, an IRBM

launched from an ocean platform can have the same target coverage and the same military effect as an ICBM launched from our own country.

The problem we face in keeping the peace is to convince the enemy that, even if he strikes first, we will be able to strike back just as hard, perhaps harder.

If we kept 50 Polaris submarines at sea at all times, constantly on the move, hard to find, and next to impossible to destroy, we should have a formidable deterrent to Soviet attack. No matter how effective an enemy might think a sneak attack against our cities and land bases might be, he would know he could not avoid a crushing return blow by our underseas force.

I think it very likely that the Polaris system, if set up in strength, could become the Free World's main deterrent, retaliatory force.

The 1958 supplemental budget provides funds for our first three Polaris missile submarines, and we are told money for six more will be requested. This number falls short of what we should order this year. We can move more rapidly toward the objective of 100 such submarines by starting 15 of them immediately, 6 more than are presently contemplated.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the able Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator stresses the Polaris missile. Nearly everybody connected with its development has also emphasized the importance of that missile. Will the Senator not agree with me that if we do not have the submarines to launch the missile, the missile cannot perform its intended mission?

Mr. JACKSON. The statement of the Senator is correct. It is very important that we take parallel action on both the missile and the submarine. In other words, we are facing a situation in which we shall probably, unless we do something about it, have Polaris missiles without their launching platforms; namely, nuclear-powered submarines. The missile is only half of the weapon system. Unless we have the means to launch it we lose its deterrent value.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, may I ask the other half of that question? Do we have the Polaris missile?

Mr. JACKSON. The answer is "No." If all of the schedules work out as planned, we will make good progress on the Polaris missile.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then, if we do not have the Polaris missile, why should we build Polaris missile submarines?

Mr. JACKSON. The objective, of course, is to produce the Polaris missile on a schedule that will tie it in with the submarine, so that the missile can be married to the submarine on a concurrent basis.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What the Senator means is that the two items, the Polaris missile submarine and the Polaris missile, should be developed simultaneously.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is correct.

Sixth. We should radically accelerate our antisubmarine warfare programs

and provide for a Vice Chief of Staff for Undersea Warfare.

The Soviet Union has the largest undersea fleet in the world—over 500 submarines, many with missile-launching capability. Admiral Rickover told Congress this year that if the Russians were to commence building atomic submarines now at a fraction of the rate they have been building conventional submarines we would even lose our present lead in nuclear submarines—and as early as 1961.

At the current building rate we will have only about 15 nuclear submarines in operation before 1961.

Moscow may not yet have the equivalent of the Polaris submarine system, but she can build it soon. When that day comes most of the United States will be within range of nuclear attack from the sea.

In the face of this threat, are we doing enough to keep our ocean lifelines open? Are we preparing to safeguard our mainland from missiles launched from Soviet submarines?

The truth is our antisubmarine methods are still mainly conventional and of little value against the unconventional threat. We have only begun to develop the new ships, train the new men, and achieve the needed breakthroughs in detection techniques.

Rear Adm. Rawson Bennett, Chief of Naval Research, has testified before Congress that "at this point we are not in the very rapid state of advance in antisubmarine warfare."

Thus far antisubmarine warfare has relied on a strategy of attrition. Even when the target was a conventional submarine, the detection and kill record has been low. Now with the coming of the nuclear submarine every difficulty is multiplied.

We need to aim for 100 percent detection and 100 percent kill. The frightful destructive power of one enemy submarine makes anything less inadequate. One submarine alive can mean one American city dead.

The 1959 budget includes a request for some additional money for antisubmarine warfare, but the increase is not very substantial.

Once more, I believe we are short-changing a vital program. We must win the race for discovery of new detection techniques. We need to order more attack and hunter-killer submarines that can sink Russian submarines. There is every justification for budgeting ample funds for these purposes.

I also want to repeat my earlier suggestion for the appointment of a Vice Chief of Staff for Undersea Warfare to help get the effort into higher gear, and maintain it that way.

Seventh. We should build up the Army to 18 divisions and fully modernize its equipment—the pentomic division should really be made pentomic.

The greatest threat we face is all-out Soviet attack, but this is not the most likely threat—today. As long as American power can still devastate an aggressor, Moscow may refrain from an all-out blow.

The Kremlin doubtless prefers to inherit the world, if it can, rather than

demolish it. Our most probable immediate military danger is the limited Soviet probe and penetration carefully calculated not to arouse this country to a showdown.

This being their likely tactic, we require modern mobile forces prepared to prevent local engagements from getting out of hand. As Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Army Chief of Staff, said in 1956: "If the small war breaks out, we must suppress it promptly, because that small war may easily lead to the great war which we are all trying to avoid."

In the light of this requirement what have we done? Illogically and disastrously as it is, we have relentlessly cut our Army from 20 divisions, to 18, and then to 15 at the end of this fiscal year. Now Congress is asked in the 1959 budget to give its blessing to a 14-division Army.

This further cut is proposed despite testimony by such men as General Gavin, Chief of Army Research and Development, that even with the present number of army divisions we are not in a position to fight a limited war.

Eight of our divisions are deployed overseas, three are really training organizations, leaving us with a striking force of three or at the most four divisions. This is an absurdly small force to compare with the 175 Soviet divisions.

These Soviet divisions are poised to threaten such critical areas as the Middle East, Southeast Asia, and Europe. We ask the nations who are under the muzzles of Soviet guns to resist the powerful forces across their frontiers; we pledge our assistance. Yet we would be hard pressed to move only one division by air transportation, and these countries, and the Soviets, know this fact.

The Army has recognized the need to adapt to the nuclear age. It has reorganized its active divisions under the pentomic concept to provide greater mobility, greater striking power, and faster reaction to the changing conditions of battle.

These new pentomic divisions, however, are still shackled to World War II equipment. At the rate modern equipment is being provided it will be several years before the new divisions are anything but paper pentomic.

General Taylor, Army Chief of Staff, recently testified: "I do not believe that the Army can modernize to the extent I consider necessary without a significant increase over the funds received in recent years."

But this is not all. Congress is asked in the 1959 budget to reduce Army Reserve components. A case might be made for holding down the Regular Army if we had enough Army Reserve divisions equipped and trained to constitute combat-ready units. But it makes no sense whatsoever to cut back the Regular Army and simultaneously deal a body blow to the Reserve program.

Clearly, we should provide this country with a modern Army, equipped to fight on today's battlefield. Its strength should be restored to 18 active divisions as a minimum; the rate of modernization should be speeded up; and the Reserve forces program should be assured steady support.

Mr. President, one final point. In matters of national security—in matters, in other words, affecting freedom's life and death—it is not the business of the executive branch or Congress to shy away from necessary programs simply because they demand sacrifices of our people. It is the business of both branches of Government to tell the people honestly and clearly what is needed for our survival, and to fight for programs that will meet those needs.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has given a very excellent address this afternoon. Speaking for myself, the Senator has given me a great deal to think about. As I go back over what the Senator said, it appears to me he considers that at the present time the Strategic Air Command is our greatest deterrent to war; that there are possibilities of real defense in a submersible naval setup; that the Army is being reduced to a maximum of 14 divisions in the 1959 budget, and, I might add, that the Marine Corps is also being reduced to some extent at the same time.

My reaction to the Senator's excellent speech—and I must compliment him for "laying it on the line"—is that at the present time the Strategic Air Command is not only the main deterrent we have to prevent an all-out struggle, but it is in a real sense the keeper of the peace.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank my good friend for his kind remarks. What he had to say about the Strategic Air Command is completely true. It is the main deterrent to all-out war.

In the manned bomber area we have the one opportunity to build up our retaliatory capability now. This we must do at this session of the Congress.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Washington for what I consider a very timely and constructive speech on some very live subjects. He is well qualified to speak on those subjects.

For emphasis, I wish to say that I came from the Preparedness Subcommittee hearings with the very strong conviction that we ought to expand the program of B-52 heavy bomber production, with its service auxiliary, the KC-135 tanker, because, after all, they are our quick weapons for instant defense or retaliation. They are weapons in being, of proved capability. They are our chief reliance as of this time. They can be manufactured speedily and manned and made ready. I think we have already been burning daylight, and we are continuing to burn daylight without action on anything like the scale on which we should be producing these weapons.

I wish to commend as well as thank Col. Ken BeLieu, of the Senate Armed Services Committee staff, for his most valuable and untiring work on this bill. Colonel BeLieu is not only willing, but he is able, and his services are always most helpful to our committee.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, shortly after the Congress convened, President Eisenhower requested a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1958 for the construction of facilities deemed imperative to meet the increased Soviet threat, and particularly in the field of long-range missiles and satellites. The Preparedness Subcommittee of our Armed Services Committee has made an exhaustive study in order to evaluate our military posture, in order to insure effective combat readiness of our armed services.

For 110 days seventy-seven-some witnesses were heard by the committee, and around 200 experts were interviewed by the staff. Countless authorities, including outstanding scientists, top industrialists, and high Defense Department officials, testified in open sessions. A good many of these witnesses and our Central Intelligence people testified also in closed sessions.

The report declared that the Soviets presently have the advantage in ballistic missiles, outer-space satellites, and in submarine numbers. No one disputed, however, the present power of our superb Strategic Air Command to strike devastating blows of almost total destruction.

Among other recommendations, the committee suggested that the Defense Department—

Strengthen our Strategic Air Command and disperse our SAC bases.

Step up production of our Atlas—ICBM—and our Thor and Jupiter—IRBM's.

Start immediately on the development of manned missiles.

Reorganize the Defense Department, particularly the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Improve our distant early warning system and develop a detection system for ballistic missiles.

Expand research and development programs.

Modernize civilian defense.

Some of these recommendations have already been adopted, and some are on the fire. When the chips are down, the American people will get on with the job and come through in good shape. In order to launch deadly counterstrikes, SAC must have available an early warning system, alert facilities, proper dispersal, and trained personnel. Before long, Mr. President, in my judgment, we will close the gap on Soviet progress in the missile field, and I have every confidence that in the meantime we can rely on our splendid Strategic Air Command.

Mr. President, as the report indicates, this bill authorizes certain construction to augment the ICBM complex planned for Warren Air Force Base in my State. The bill includes construction projects in the amount of \$112,400,000 in support of the acceleration of the program covering the intercontinental and the intermediate-range ballistic-missile program. The operational plan for these weapons provides for the manning and equipping of Strategic Air Command squadrons on a constantly alert basis, with the capability of launching the missiles within minutes after initial warning of attack. It is well to point out here, Mr. President, that the Congress has done its full

part in providing the necessary funds in record time in order to meet the Soviet threat.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, line 24, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to delete the word "funds" and insert in lieu thereof the word "authorizations".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish and develop certain installations for the national security, and for other purposes."

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. CASE, of South Dakota, conferees on the part of the Senate.

PROPOSED SMALL BUSINESS BANK SYSTEM

During the delivery of Mr. STENNIS' remarks,

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIER in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Mississippi may yield to me, with the understanding that he not lose the floor, and with the further understanding that the statement which I desire to make shall be printed at another point in the RECORD, so as not to disturb the continuity of the speech being made by the Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on yesterday, the distinguished chairman of the House Small Business Committee, Mr. PATMAN, introduced a bill creating a Small Business Capital Bank System, with the aim of making available to small business a source of equity and long-term loan capital where it is not available on reasonable terms from existing private sources. I now in-

troduce for appropriate reference, the identical bill.

There is not a Senator in this body, Mr. President, who is not conscious of the need for capital in our small businesses. There is not a Senator who has not devoted time to the study of the problems of small business; and there is not a Senator who is unaware that, despite the efforts of private enterprise, and of the Small Business Administration, small business remains in great need of capital with which to grow, to compete, and even to survive.

Distinguished Members of this body have proposed legislation to make this capital available through various agencies and institutions.

On yesterday, the Senate agreed to a resolution which provides funds for the Select Committee on Small Business, which is headed by its able and alert chairman, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

I have been very much impressed by the method selected by Representative PATMAN and his colleagues, after months of investigation into the problems of small business. It appears to me to meet the substantial objections raised by the administration and the Federal Reserve Board to several of the other proposed methods.

In effect, it is patterned after the Federal land-bank system. The Federal land banks have been paid out; they have paid back the capital the Government put into them. Associations of farmers now own them.

In the same way, borrowers under the small-business system will contribute by taking stock in the banks; and it is contemplated that eventually the borrowers will pay back to the Treasury every bit of the Government money. So the banks will eventually be owned privately, and will become a definite part of our private enterprise system.

I urge the Senate to examine this proposed legislation. I believe it represents an intelligent and logical step which we may take toward making available to small business the lifeblood it needs in today's competitive world. And, finally, Mr. President, it will make that step within a framework of private enterprise.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

The Small Business Capital Bank System bill would do the following:

First. It would establish a Small Business Capital Bank Board as an independent agency of the Government of the United States. With a central office in Washington, the Board would supervise a system of 12 small-business capital banks—1 in each Federal Reserve district.

The Board would consist of 13 members, 1 from each Reserve district, and 1 at large. Second. The Board would subscribe to \$10 million of capital stock in each small-business capital bank. This stock would be retired when all of the authorized capital stock of each bank is subscribed by small-business investment associations.

Third. These investment associations, created in each State by small-business concerns, would subscribe to shares in the small-business bank in their areas.

Thus the bill provides for eventual private ownership of the small-business banks by small-business investment associations.

The associations would be patterned along the lines of the national farm loan associa-

tions and production credit associations, which operate within the framework of the Federal Land Bank System.

Fourth. The funds to be used by the 12 small-business banks, in providing capital for the investment associations for their investment in small businesses, would be secured from the Small Business Capital Bank Board. The Board would supply those funds by purchasing debenture bonds from the banks—and the Board would secure its own funds from private investors, through the sale of its own debenture bonds on the open market.

This is much the same procedure as is used by FNMA—Fannie May, the Federal National Mortgage Association.

The bill makes it clear that the Board's obligations do not impose any liability on the United States.

This is the method of operation proposed for the Small Business Capital Bank System.

It does not require an appropriation by Congress. The money to be used by the Board comes from an earned surplus of idle money in the Federal Reserve accounts, and from \$28 million now held almost untouched by the Federal Reserve in its small-business account. The Reserve Board does not believe it ought to be in that kind of loan business; this bill will take it out, and put the money to good use.

This system represents no competitive challenge to private industry. Private lending institutions would be urged to participate in it. Its benefits will be widespread; but they will not be available to those who can secure equity and long-term loan capital from private sources.

Lastly, it would be owned by those who take part in it—not by the Government. Private ownership of the land bank system is a reality now, as it would be, eventually, in the Small Business Capital Bank System.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to express my appreciation to the Senator from Mississippi for his customarily generous treatment and consideration of me.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Texas. I have been glad to yield to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3191) to create a Small Business Capital Bank System to make available to small business a source of equity and long-term loan capital where such capital is not available on reasonable terms from existing private sources; to transfer to such system all funds which are presently available under section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act for loans to industrial and commercial firms, together with certain other funds out of the surplus accounts of the Federal Reserve banks; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL],

the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and myself, I introduce a bill for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3194) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to establish an initial program of tax adjustment for small and independent business and for persons engaged in small and independent business, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN for himself and other Senators, was received, read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, during the recess between sessions of the 85th Congress, your Small Business Committee conducted extensive hearings in 14 cities across the land in connection with its study of the impact of Federal taxation on small business. After a careful study of the hearing record the committee now offers its report which embodies its findings and recommendations. These findings and recommendations are based on the testimony of 456 persons, representative of all forms of business activity, who appeared before or gave statements to the committee.

The testimony presented established what your committee has feared for some time. The impact of Federal taxes is not the same on all segments of the economy. There are changes which are urgently required if our economic system is to remain as we have known it. It has been conclusively shown that small business has been denied equal opportunity under our tax law as it is presently written. The free enterprise system requires a dynamic independent business which cannot exist when entry for the new and growth for the small are hampered.

The chief recommendation of the report is for a speedy consideration and passage of the small business tax adjustment bill of 1958 which I have just introduced, and which is attached as an appendix to the report. This is an omnibus measure which attempts to treat all matters requiring immediate action. Where problems are not so acute or needs not shown to be so great, further study or a general plan of adjustment is recommended.

The small business tax adjustment bill of 1958 has been drafted to assist small business to meet the responsibilities of a growing and expanding economy. However, this measure will be of great benefit to the whole economy. It is not class legislation nor an attempt to set segment against segment. There is no attempt to restrict its application only to small concerns. Instead, amendment of the Revenue Code to grant equal treatment for all business regardless of size or form of organization has been the central purpose.

I am delighted that the great majority of the committee members have joined as cosponsors of the bill which I have introduced.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be allowed to lie on the table until the close of business tomorrow, in order that other Senators who may wish to join in sponsoring it may have the privilege of doing so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The measure is constructed around a reinvestment allowance which is provided for in section 2 of the bill. This section has as its purpose to permit smaller concerns to retain earnings for necessary growth and expansion. This would be accomplished by allowing 50 percent of the first \$10,000, 30 percent of the second \$10,000, and 20 percent of the third \$10,000, which is reinvested in depreciable property or inventory as a deduction from current income for tax purposes. This allowance would be available for all concerns with a maximum of \$10,000.

The revenue loss will not be great because the allowance is granted only for expenditures made during the year. The expenditures must necessarily be twice as great as the allowance, even in the first instance, and the whole of the expenditures will be income in the hands of the recipients. Secondly, the greater portion of the reinvestment will be channeled into depreciable assets for which no depreciation deduction will be permitted. Thus, even for the taxpayer himself, this measure largely allows a deferral rather than an absolute reduction of tax.

In order that this section may not be used to avoid taxes, gain on the sale of property, where this allowance was taken on purchase, will be considered as ordinary income rather than capital gain to the extent of the unexpended allowance. It is also provided that more than one concern having the same ownership must be considered as one for the purpose of this section. The purpose of this provision is to assist the continuing operation of independent concerns which are most troubled by a need for equity financing.

The third section of the bill extends equal opportunity to all taxpayers who wish to provide for their own retirement. Presently, persons who are members of a qualified pension, profit-sharing, or stock-bonus plan under section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 get preferred treatment. Under this proposed section any person not a member of a section 401 qualified plan would be eligible to deduct up to 10 percent of his income or \$1,000, whichever is less, for amounts he deposits for his retirement.

The deposits would necessarily have to be made in a manner to remove the taxpayer from immediate control of the funds deposited. As matters of equity, the provision permits a 5-year carry-over of the unused portion of the allowable deduction, and permits an increased deduction for taxpayers over 50 years of age at the time this measure is enacted. This section would defer the collection of tax until benefits are received from the plan. It would equalize treatment for all taxpayers.

Section 4 would permit certain estates the opportunity to pay Federal estate taxes by installments over a period of up to 10 years. Many small concerns have been doomed when the owner-operator died because of the drainage of all liquid funds into payment of estate taxes. Under present law, except after showing of hardship, all estate taxes are due within 15 months after death of the

decendent. This proposal would free estates tied up in nonliquid business investment from this terrible burden.

This provision would actually increase the revenue received because 6 percent interest is charged on the unpaid balance where this election is taken. Because of the deferral there would be a small revenue reduction the first few years. It is provided that all the unpaid balance is immediately due and payable where the estate misses a payment on tax or interest and where the assets of the estate are sold.

The fifth section of the bill would extend the benefits of the alternative methods of depreciation to purchasers of used property. The 1954 Internal Revenue Code, section 167, provided that purchasers of new property had a right to use certain methods for computing their depreciation for tax purposes. This provided a tax advantage to purchasers of new equipment denied to those taxpayers who could not afford or did not wish to purchase new property. There seems to be no good reason why taxpayers should be treated differently merely because one purchases a new machine while the other chooses a similar used piece. This section would give equality of depreciation treatment to all taxpayers making purchases of property new-in-use to them.

As an aid to small corporations the sixth section grants an election to corporations to be taxed as partnerships. This would remove double taxation from consideration as a factor in determining under what legal form a business should be operated. This proposal complements section 1361 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which permits certain proprietorships and partnerships to be taxed as corporations.

Section 7 of the proposed legislation would increase the minimum accumulated earnings credit from \$60,000 to \$100,000. This would take some of the pressure off the smaller corporations which are most restricted by the unreasonable accumulation of surplus penalty. It will recognize the inflation which has cut the value of the original \$60,000 and provide some added equity financing.

The last section of this bill would compel the Treasury to acquiesce in decisions of the Tax Court or Court of Appeals unless it chose to appeal. This would provide for the same treatment for all taxpayers and finality in the interpretation of the Internal Revenue Code.

I firmly believe that all these measures are necessary. If small business is to continue to serve its vital part in our economy, then tax adjustment is necessary to equalize opportunity. I fervently hope that my colleagues will give this legislation the support I believe it deserves.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, the bill involves many of the President's suggestions regarding taxation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And one or two additional features, for careful consideration.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I have the honor to be a member of the Small Business Committee, and the honor of joining in sponsorship of this bill.

I was greatly impressed by the hearings which were conducted on the subject of taxation as related to small business, and noted the strong feeling of small business that this problem represents a very serious difficulty. Under the very distinguished guidance of our chairman, we are endeavoring to do something about the problem.

I think it should be made clear in the Record, however—and I say this as a lawyer, and I know that my chairman will bear with me—that I have some serious doubts as to that part of the bill which relates to the acquiescence by the Treasury Department in determinations of courts on tax matters.

This question may present some real problems in administrative feasibility. However, I feel very strongly, in company with my colleagues, that we must give urgent attention to the question of tax help for small business. For that reason, I was glad of the privilege to be a cosponsor of the bill. I feel that the legislative process will enable us to deal with all of the problems involved.

I should like also to add that it is my deep conviction that two other problems are very serious to small business. One is the problem of antitrust enforcement. With respect to that problem, I feel that we may very well have to adopt a different approach for small business than for the generality of business, looking more to the affirmative side than to the negative side; for example, stopping mergers and other things which may be desired.

Secondly, there is the problem of technical assistance to small business in research and development and other areas.

Management problems remain among the most important problems of all business enterprise in the United States. The committee under the very distinguished guidance of my colleague, the Senator from Alabama, has such a wonderful record that I am confident that we shall deal as effectively with the other problems as our chairman is now leading us to deal with the problem of taxation as it affects small business.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the junior Senator from New York. I agree with him on the antitrust phase. Furthermore, he mentioned a provision of the proposed legislation about which he has some misgivings. So do I, so far as the mechanics of it are concerned. However, I do believe that every business in the country, whether it be large or small, ought to know what its status is in a given situation, and that the Treasury should not have the privilege of shopping around among districts or circuits for a favorable decision.

Mr. JAVITS. I can see nothing but good coming from the exposure of our

position and that of the Treasury in that connection.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I shall be happy to yield. First I should like to say that the Senator from Wisconsin came to the committee as a brand new Member of the Senate at the close of the last session of the Senate. Nevertheless he played a very important part in our tax hearings. All the tax hearings, held throughout the country, were participated in by every member of the committee, with the exception of one member. Only one member was prevented by reason of a previous commitment from participating in every hearing. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the very kind and gracious remarks of my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the committee.

Mr. President, as a Senator elected only 5 months ago, I rise with reluctance to join my distinguished colleagues in support of this bill which is so largely the result of their labors and so little the result of my own. On the other hand just because I was so recently elected, because I have had the chance so recently to talk with literally thousands of little-business men in every section of Wisconsin, I feel very deeply that this bill is urgently needed and needed at once.

Mr. President, I recall at our hearing in Milwaukee, the referee in bankruptcy for southern Wisconsin testified to this small-business committee that business failures in Wisconsin last year were greater than ever before—greater indeed, than in 1932. And virtually every one of these business failures was a small-business failure. Since 5 months ago small business has not been doing better. It has been doing progressively worse and much worse. Many small businesses are failing. Few small businesses can grow even a little. And literally no small businesses today can grow into a competitive position with big business. Why? Because of the Federal taxation straitjacket under which they suffer. I enthusiastically support this bill; but I do have one serious qualification. There is one section of this bill which I strongly feel may need correction. I intend to scrutinize this section very carefully, to study the testimony on the bill before the Finance Committee, and if necessary to introduce an amendment to correct it.

Mr. President, I am very grateful to our remarkably able chairman and splendid staff for their assistance to me as a new Senator in connection with this bill.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I rise to join with and support the remarks of the able chairman of the Small Business Committee. The legislation which has been offered today is worthy of the support of all Members of this body. The proposed Small Business Tax Adjustment Act of 1953 was drafted only after a very careful study of the needs of the small-business community and was designed to give equality of treatment to all business.

As ranking minority member of the Small Business Committee and its former chairman, I took a very active part in this study. I know from first-hand experience of the mass of information which was gathered during the hearings. The findings and recommendations of the tax report were made after careful consideration of all testimony offered by representatives of all forms of business activity.

The chairman is to be commended for the manner in which this study was conducted. Hearings were held in all parts of the country so that a broad perspective could be gained. This has been a bipartisan effort.

The bipartisan nature of the study is exemplified by the fact that each of the six minority members took an active part in the hearings. The proposed legislation is offered by Members from both sides of the aisle, and includes three sections which have been recommended by the administration.

On Thursday, January 16, Secretary of the Treasury Anderson, in testifying before the House Ways and Means Committee, recommended four measures for immediate action which would be of great benefit particularly to small business. Three of these measures correspond to sections 4, 5, and 6 of the proposed Small Business Tax Adjustment Act. Section 4 would permit installment payments of estate taxes for certain qualified estates. Section 5 would extend the use of section 167 alternative methods of depreciation to the purchasers of used as well as new property. Finally, section 6 would provide an election for corporations to be taxed as partnerships. All of these measures were more than adequately supported in testimony given to the committee.

I want to single out two other provisions which I believe to be especially important. The second section of the bill dealing with a reinvestment allowance is greatly needed to permit smaller concerns to grow and develop to meet their expanding markets. I was greatly impressed by the numerous witnesses who testified to the great importance of this kind of provision.

Section 3 of the bill would remove the worst kind of discrimination from the present Internal Revenue Code. Under this section, all taxpayers would be given the same opportunity to provide for their retirement. Under the present law, only a limited group gets special tax treatment for retirement programs. Thrift and individual provision for retirement are worthy of Government support, but certainly favors should be extended to all taxpayers.

The other sections are as important if small business is to be given equal opportunity. Each has been designed to remedy specific problems which need urgent attention.

I am very proud to sponsor this piece of legislation. I urge that all Members of this body consider its merits. I believe that it will offer renewed opportunity for small business to share in the growing prosperity of the country.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, first I wish to commend the distinguished chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business for his able leadership in the entire small-business field, particularly in connection with the problem of the impact of taxation on the small-business man.

It was my privilege to attend 3 hearings of the committee, 1 in San Francisco, another in Denver, and the third in Wichita.

If there was one thing that immediately became apparent to me, it was the sincerity of the small-business people who appeared before the committee. They recognize the many problems which confront those of us who are privileged to serve in Congress, particularly the continuing problem of raising tax revenue. It did not seem to me that they were asking for anything unreasonable; they wanted only fair treatment and the simple opportunity of keeping small business on Main Street of America.

I am hopeful that out of the bill and the resulting hearings there will come some concrete results in that connection. I again wish to commend the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from Nevada. I appreciate the fine work he did, and I certainly concur in his hope.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 10021) to provide that the 1955 formula for taxing income of life insurance companies shall also apply to taxable years beginning in 1957, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 10021. An act to provide that the 1955 formula for taxing income of life insurance companies shall also apply to taxable years beginning in 1957; and

H. J. Res. 439. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Seventh International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

COMMEMORATION OF FIRST FLIGHT OF AN AIRPLANE ON AN ARMY INSTALLATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1252, H. R. 6078. I am asking merely that it be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6078) to provide for the erection of suit-

able markers at Fort Myer, Va., to commemorate the first flight of an airplane on an Army installation, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and myself I wish to express our very deep appreciation to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] for joining with us in the sponsorship of S. 1134, the Morse-Clark omnibus education bill. I was pleased this morning to cosponsor with the Senator from Alabama the education bill he introduced. The Senator from Alabama will be known for many years for his distinguished career in the Senate, and a leading element of that career, in my judgment, will be his statesmanship in the field of education.

I was pleased to join in the sponsorship of the education bill which he introduced this morning. However, as the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] so correctly pointed out when he discussed the Hill bill this morning, it is a bill which deals primarily with assistance on an emergency basis to higher education in the United States. That is important, and I shall do what I can in this session of Congress to support meeting that emergency need.

Although I am not wedded to the Hill bill to such an extent that I would not consider amendments to it, as I am sure would be the position of the author himself, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], I regard it as a long step in the right direction. At the same time I think we need to reflect on the observation of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] this morning when he pointed out that the Hill scholarship bill does not deal with the real crisis in American education.

The crisis in American education is at the elementary and secondary school levels. The crisis in American education is one which deals with a long-term need for the decades immediately ahead; which will give us a nationwide educational program that will stop wasting American brainpower; which will put us in a position where we can keep ahead of Russia in the development of brainpower. We are falling behind Russia now. One has only to sit, as I sat this morning in a public hearing conducted by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and listen to a great scientist, such as Dr. Teller, to realize how true was the comment of the junior Senator from Wisconsin this morning. The Senator from Wisconsin joined in the warnings which many of us have raised in the Senate for the past many years, as we have sought to awaken and inform the American people about what has happened to education in this country, and about how far we are actually falling behind Russia in

the matter of developing our potential brainpower.

So we welcome the junior Senator from Wisconsin as a cosponsor with us of S. 1134. We intend to continue to press for the omnibus approach, which is, of course, foreign to the philosophy of the present administration. The President of the United States has never given the slightest indication that he has the faintest concept of the educational crisis in America.

We hope we will get hearings on S. 1134, which brings up to date an educational program of a far-seeing Republican in this field, a man who, too, was subjected to the same public attack on this issue which those of us who are sponsoring S. 1134 are subjected to by the reactionary forces of the country. I refer, of course, to the former Senator from Ohio, Robert Taft. What the Morse-Clark bill does primarily is to bring up to date the Taft bill of 1947 and the Taft bill of 1949, of which it was my privilege to be one of the cosponsors. Through our voluntary committee of Democrats, the Taft bill has been brought up to date in S. 1134, and we plead again for favorable consideration of it by the Senate this year.

INCREASED FREIGHT RATES, 1958

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this morning, at the request of the Governor of Oregon, the Honorable Robert Holmes, and of the chairman of the public utilities commission of our State, Mr. Howard Morgan, I presented in an oral argument to the Interstate Commerce Commission Oregon's case in opposition to the attempt on the part of the railroads to increase freight rates in our State in a proceeding designated as Ex parte 212, being conducted by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The attempt to impose upon Oregon business this additional burden and cost is, in the opinion of our Governor, the chairman of our public utilities commission, and the senior Senator from Oregon—and I am sure the same view would be held by my teammate, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]—unwarranted by the facts. So I presented Oregon's case against it at this morning's hearing.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the argument which I presented in behalf of the State of Oregon before the Interstate Commerce Commission this morning in the case known as Ex parte 212.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE BEFORE THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION ON EX PARTE NO. 212, INCREASED FREIGHT RATES, 1958

Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, this morning I am appearing before the Commission at the requests of Hon. Robert Holmes, Governor of the State of Oregon, and Mr. Howard Morgan, Public Utilities Commissioner of the State of Oregon, for the purpose of making a brief statement on the pending proceedings, Ex parte 212. I am also making this statement as a United States Senator from the State of

Oregon and as a member of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business.

It is my earnest request that the Commission give thorough consideration in the course of its deliberations on Ex parte No. 212 to certain very serious allegations that have been brought to my attention in numerous instances by small-business men of Oregon. They contend that the increased rates and charges proposed by the major railroads in this proceeding will, if put into effect, result in the shutting down of many small business operations, not only in Oregon, but in the entire Pacific Northwest. They feel that under the procedure applicable to this case, very little opportunity is available to small-business men to present a case to the Commission which would be as effective as the facts would warrant if more time were available for the marshalling of evidence and materials in rebuttal to the request of the railroads.

Last weekend it was my privilege to visit several western Oregon communities and to talk with businessmen and their employees. In these communities the No. 1 industry is lumber and it is the foundation of their economic life. The facts concerning the condition of business and industry throughout the State of Oregon, and particularly in those areas where lumber is of primary importance, do not make a pleasant story, but it is my opinion that those facts have a direct bearing upon any decision that the Interstate Commerce Commission may render in this case. Therefore, I ask that these economic facts of life be weighed by the Commission before coming to a decision in Ex parte No. 212.

In my State, more persons filed bankruptcy petitions in 1957 than in any year since 1929; deposits in Portland banks and branches were down about 3 percent; unemployment in Oregon for the week ending December 28 was up 13,743 from 1956 as shown by unemployment-insurance records. Nationally, the cost of living is up at least 3.4 percent from 1956, an all-time high; the average workweek was 39.2 hours, compared with 40.5 hours in 1956. All of these facts are of vital importance because they indicate that the economy of Oregon today is not one that will be receptive to the burdens to be imposed by the railroads under the proposed tariff of rates and charges in Ex parte No. 212.

THE QUICK INCREASE PROCEDURE—A HANDICAP FOR SMALL BUSINESS

The railroads have employed a quick procedure to obtain rate increases and the approval of additional charges at the expense of Oregon shippers. The business firms which depend upon the railroads for transportation of their products to markets in the Midwest and east coast, will have to pass these new costs on to the already overburdened consuming public, or in the alternative, to absorb the additional costs in the competitive market. There is no third alternative for the small-business man other than that of going out of business and from the information I have received I fear that the third alternative may become predominant in too many instances if the request of the major railroads is approved by the Commission.

The businessmen who have talked to me on this matter have spoken earnestly and those who have written to me have vigorously expressed the view that if they were given the opportunity to properly present their case in opposition to the request of the railroads, it is quite likely that all or a major portion of the demands of the petition of the railroads would be denied by the Commission. These businessmen charge that under the quick procedure being employed, the chance of making the effective presentation that could be made against the increased rate petition is almost impossible. This point was very effectively expressed by the Honorable

Robert Holmes, Governor of the State of Oregon, in a letter to me dated January 16, in which he strongly protested the speed-up short-form procedures envisaged in this case. Governor Holmes put it this way:

"On December 27, the Commission issued an order scheduling hearings concerning Ex parte 212 under the so-called short form procedure. This order generally provided that all statements, all evidence, all exhibits, all showings of any description made or submitted by the public in defense of the public interest must be prepared and on file with the Commission at Washington, D. C., on or before January 20, 1958.

"This order and the supporting statements of the railroads which, of necessity, have to be answered by the public by January 20, were not received by this office or any Pacific coast commission prior to January 6 or 7, 1958. This left exactly 6 working days in which to review voluminous statements of railroad officials and thereafter prepare evidence and exhibits in opposition to the proposed rail increases. It is utterly impossible for Oregon public utility commissioner's staff properly to prepare any type of responsible exhibits or evidence in this short space of time.

"The notice of hearing and the exhibits of the railroads were only sent out to public service commissions and parties appearing in past hearings. Many of the selective rate increases in this case will affect businesses and industries in this State which have not been seriously affected before and therefore have not been parties to past proceedings.

"Yesterday, January 15, more than a dozen letters were received from lumber people throughout the State of Oregon asking what they must do to defend their interests and stating that they had not heard of the proceedings until within the current week. Numerous telephone calls were received from traffic managers of lumber associations, grain associations, and export associations in the State. Uniformly they told the same story and that is that they do not even have time to get together data and people in their organizations and prepare them to make any showing in this proceeding in defense of their businesses and industries."

The foregoing comments of Governor Holmes give a very significant description of the handicaps borne by those who seek to prevent a summary type of proceeding in this case. My file contains similar protests from small-business men of Oregon and I note that many of these protests have been communicated formally to the Commission. Their views parallel those of Governor Holmes and I submit Governor Holmes' statement as being an excellent presentation of the small-business man's typical observation on this score.

THE PROPOSED INCREASED RATES DISCRIMINATE AGAINST THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST AND SMALL-BUSINESS MEN

The shippers of lumber who registered their protests with my office in Ex parte 212 particularly protested that portion of the petition of the railroads which involves a 2-percent increase on lumber and forest products.

They contended—with great merit, I believe—that this constitutes a further discrimination against shippers of lumber in the Pacific Northwest. A percentage increase serves only to add to the ratio of the handicaps of west coast shippers of lumber who are already burdened with more acute problems of higher transportation costs than are their competitors, who supply lumber and forest products and other commodities from areas that are closer to the Midwest and east coast markets. A uniform increase in terms of cents and dollars would be difficult enough to absorb under the present highly competitive conditions and a declining demand for lumber, but the percentage

increase piled on top of existing burdensome rates, because of longer distances to markets, will effectively eliminate a good many small businesses from the economic structure of the State of Oregon and the Pacific Northwest. I am sure the Commission does not wish to become even indirectly an instrumentality of injury to small business.

Increased accessorial charges burdensome to small business

The substantial increases in accessorial charges proposed by the railroads will be, according to small business, most oppressive. The small-business man in the lumber industry must necessarily rely upon methods of loading, transporting and distributing lumber far different and more complex than those employed in established lumber operations of the big business category. These charges if approved by the Commission will add substantially to the costs of doing business to be borne by the small business operation and in many instances they simply cannot be borne under present day conditions in the lumber industry. As one small-business man stated this problem to me:

"The portion to which we take particular exception is the extremely excessive increases, many as high as 50 percent, for service and accommodations, also the entirely new charges, which previously have been included in the overall freight rates. We feel that all independent business, in its base price structure, is obliged to include some service and accommodations, as these particular items have been handled by the railroads in the past.

"The service and accommodation charges, to which I have reference, are for stopover to complete loading, stopover for partial loading, milling and sorting in transit, reconsignment in transit, or before or after arrival at destination, releases of shipments before or after arrival at destination, etc. These services are an integral part of the business of wholesale lumber.

"Wholesale lumber coordinates independent production of lumber and far-reaching distribution of the product throughout the country, and for export. This method of lumber distribution, long established and a recognized part of our Nation's economy, coordinates the independent lumber production and independent distribution, as directly contrasted to the large monopoly type of single ownership mill operation, which combines vast timber holdings, many mills, and self-ownership of retail lumber yards and lumber distribution yards located throughout the United States and selling direct to the trade.

"The service and accommodation charges which we have listed, in part, above, are vital to the practice of wholesale lumber, and relatively unused by the contrasting system of production and distribution and we feel these highly discriminating increases and new charges are aimed directly at limiting and undermining our type of business . . ."

There are many additional facets of this case which I could discuss at great length but I know that even under the very limited opportunities made available to the opponents of these rate and charge increases, additional facts will be brought to the attention of the Commission in summary form.

I close, therefore, with the earnest request that the Commission suspend the proposed increases in rates and charges, to be followed by a full investigation of the lawfulness of the proposals. Such an investigation should allow adequate time for the opponents to prepare and present their case against the railroads' proposed increases. Since coming to the hearing room this morning it has been suggested to me that the Commission might possibly delay its final decision on the freight rate increase request until field hearings could be held in the

State of Oregon and other States in the Pacific Northwest. I sincerely hope that the Commission will follow this course of action and thereby give all interested parties ample time to prepare their case against that of the railroads.

If this procedure should be followed, I feel that a strong case can be made by those who oppose the increases requested by the railroads in Ex parte 212.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the Commission for this opportunity to present the case of the State of Oregon against the proposed rate increases. I shall be pleased now to submit myself to the examination of the Commission.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, that an increase in freight rates will adversely affect Oregon's economy and the future growth of our State is evident, I believe, from the material I have presented to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I point out also that added to any freight rate increase will be the 3-percent transportation tax. Oregon industry ships goods to markets that are as far away, I believe, as are the markets of any State in the Nation. When a 3-percent excise is added to the freight bill for a lumber product shipped from Oregon to Chicago, for example, the tax is considerably greater than the amount of tax which would be paid on the same product shipped, say, from Minnesota or Mississippi.

Because the transportation tax is a proportional one, it clearly weighs most heavily on States having the largest freight charges.

I have called for the repeal of this tax many times. I believe it is a burden on all industry, and that it is unfair to consumers, who ultimately will pay for it. Being proportional, it has a discriminatory effect against west-coast industry. It should be repealed, irrespective of what is done about a freight-rate boost, but I point out that so long as it remains on the books, it will be added to any freight rate increase.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the reactionary Portland Oregonian of January 28, 1958, entitled "Optimism Versus Gloom." It reads in part:

Gov. Robert D. Holmes, Democrat, is the author of a definitely optimistic report and projection on Oregon's economy, the lead article in volume I, No. 1 of Grow With Oregon, new publication of the State Planning and Development Department.

Reaching our desk the same day was the No. 1 issue for this year of Senator Morse Reports. In this letter to constituents, Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, Democrat, repeated his denunciation of Eisenhower administration domestic policies. "In Oregon," he said, "more persons filed bankruptcy petitions in 1957 than in any year since 1929; deposits in Portland banks, including their branches elsewhere in the State, were down \$49 million, or about 3 percent; unemployment insurance was \$48,549 for the week ended December 28, up \$13,748 from the year before.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPTIMISM VERSUS GLOOM

Gov. Robert D. Holmes, Democrat, is the author of a definitely optimistic report and projection on Oregon's economy, the lead article in volume I, No. 1 of Grow With

Oregon, new publication of the State Planning and Development Department.

Reaching our desk the same day was the No. 1 issue for this year of Senator Morse Reports. In this letter to constituents, Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, Democrat, repeated his denunciation of Eisenhower administration domestic policies. "In Oregon," he said, "more persons filed bankruptcy petitions in 1957 than in any year since 1929; deposits in Portland banks, including their branches elsewhere in the State, were down \$49 million, or about 3 percent; unemployment in the State among those covered by unemployment insurance was \$48,549 for the week ended December 28, up \$13,748 from the year before."

After describing his visits about the State to hear the views of business, industrial, agricultural, and public leaders, Governor Holmes made these observations:

"We became convinced, and the State apparently became convinced with us, that the talk of gloom and doom was subversive talk, talk without basis of fact. Oregonians declined to be subdued by the pessimists and I think this is the greatest hope for the new year.

"Everything seems to point to substantial recovery in our vital lumber market. A multitude of new diversified developments, announced in the last several weeks, have contradicted charges that Oregon was discouraging to business and industry."

Governor Holmes called for additional relaxation of the tight-money policy of the Federal Government and for a new policy toward power development in the Northwest. But he has been to the grassroots of the State, while Senator MORSE has not. The result: An optimistic governor; a pessimistic Senator who seems to fit into the governor's category of those preaching gloom and doom.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as in the case of so many of its previous editorial efforts, this Oregonian editorial purports to find great and significant differences among Democratic officeholders in our State.

Our Democratic Governor, Bob Holmes, is doing an outstanding job of presenting to industry the advantages of doing business in Oregon. His task is not made easier by administration policies in Washington that have produced the conditions I noted in my report.

I do not see in this editorial any refutation of these facts. Does the Oregonian deny that bank deposits are down in Portland? Does it deny that unemployment has increased from last year? Or does it merely wish to oppose Governor Holmes with Senator MORSE? I think the latter is the sole purpose of this editorial, which is a typical Oregonian politically inspired piece of propaganda on behalf of the Republican Party bosses of Oregon. They, likewise, can try to create the false impression that there is a lack of teamwork between the two Senators from Oregon, Mr. NEUBERGER and myself. I wish to say that they are going to be as unsuccessful in trying to create the false impression that there is a breach between Governor Holmes and myself as they have been in trying to create the false impression that there is a breach between the two Senators from Oregon.

I repeat and reaffirm my confidence in Oregon's future. I invite enterprise throughout the Nation to investigate the many advantages our State affords to any business. The Governor and I are

working for the same objective—namely, the growth and development of our State. Our progress toward realizing the great potential of Oregon is severely hampered by these harmful administration policies of tight money and tax favoritism to big business. In my judgment, I can do the most to help Governor Holmes in his program of attracting business by seeking the reversal of these policies that do damage to the economy of the State of Oregon. And the way to begin is to publicize the facts.

Mr. President, I also owe it to the people of my State to forewarn them of what is happening to the economy of Oregon, so we can take action within the State of Oregon to do all we can to reverse the unsound economic policies of the Eisenhower administration, as those policies have done great damage to the economy of the State of Oregon.

Mr. President, let me say to the Oregonian that it ought to be joining in helping Oregon, by publicizing the facts about the administration's policies. The Oregonian should stop doing a Tass job for the Eisenhower administration; the Oregonian should cease being a Pravda newspaper in Oregon, in covering up for the Eisenhower administration. The Oregonian should live up to the responsibilities and the ethics of journalism. It should follow the fine tenet of the great Bob La Follette, as he printed it on the masthead of the Progressive magazine at the time when he ran that outstanding publication, which still publishes as its masthead, "Ye Shall Know the Truth, and the Truth Shall Make Ye Free."

It will be a great day in Oregon when the Portland Oregonian begins printing the truth about what is happening in Oregon and elsewhere in the United States.

Mr. President, I think the Portland Oregonian got the answer to its editorial when, this morning, the senior Senator from Oregon, upon the request of the Governor of the State and its public utilities commissioner, presented Oregon's case before the Interstate Commerce Commission, in opposition to an attempt on the part of the railroads to impose upon our State an unwarranted increase in freight rates which would further damage the economy of the State of Oregon.

Mr. President, I shall turn now to another subject, before I take an airplane, to fly to New York City, to address a group of Democrats on the subject, The Shortcomings of the Eisenhower Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YARBOROUGH in the chair). The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

PROTEST REGARDING CONDUCT OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, before I leave Washington, I wish to leave in the RECORD my word of protest about the conduct of the Secretary of State in the Middle East.

Today, we read again in the newspapers the promises of millions of dollars of American taxpayers' money, that the Secretary of State has given to dictatorial leaders of totalitarian countries in the Middle East. I, for one, protest it; and I make clear that he does not speak for me, just as I am satisfied that with that program he does not speak for increasing millions of the American people.

But, Mr. President, it is the scheme and the game of this administration that under executive power—and I do not deny the existence of the power, because, after all, the Congress of the United States has given wide discretionary power to this administration—millions of dollars belonging to the taxpayers of this country are to be given away to dictatorial leaders. O Mr. President, I know that the President of the United States does not like to hear the phrase "giveaway" because it is so true; but the truth is coming home to roost on the steps of the White House and on the shoulders of Dwight D. Eisenhower.

I wish to say that what is going to happen as a result of this additional giveaway on the part of John Foster Dulles in the Middle East is that he will put many persons in the position of being able to say that we are committed; that we already have gone this far, so we must go farther.

Mr. President, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, I wish to say that there is need for an immediate reappraisal of the conduct of John Foster Dulles in the Middle East.

In the first place, I objected to his going to the Baghdad conference. The United States is not a member of the Baghdad conference. I thought it was perfectly obvious to anyone who had the slightest grain of sense in his head that if Mr. Dulles went to Baghdad, we could be quite sure that this sort of conduct would be manifested.

Mr. President, I close by saying I think this is another instance of yielding to Middle East blackmail, because if we can rely upon the press stories about what the leaders of those nations have been saying, we find that they have made it perfectly clear that they were displeased because there was not a commitment in advance of the conference that millions of dollars belonging to the taxpayers of the United States would be made available to them.

I wish to say—as I have been saying as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate—that friendship cannot be bought, and support cannot be obtained by bribe.

Mr. President, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee I intend to make a major speech next week on the foreign-aid program, military and economic, of the United States. In that speech I will outline very clearly the position I am going to take again at this session of Congress. It will be based upon the findings and recommendations of a group of experts to whom the Senate of the United States paid more than \$200,000 to conduct studies—experts from the University of Chi-

cago, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Columbia University, Princeton University, the Brookings Institution, and elsewhere. Mr. President, in this field of mutual security, we ought to heed the warnings and put into practice—until someone can prove, on the basis of facts, that they are wrong—the recommendations these experts have made. If we do, Mr. President, we shall greatly modify the foreign policy that Dwight D. Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles are following.

I am greatly concerned about it, Mr. President, because of my deep conviction that if we continue to follow this policy, we shall end, I believe, with Russia and the United States engaged in a struggle to destroy each other.

I believe there is still time—but not much—for reason to prevail. I believe there is still time for us to keep ourselves strong in defense, so that Russia will understand that she will gain nothing by an aggressive course of action.

In that respect, Mr. President, my thesis is along the lines of the thesis of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], in the great speech he made this afternoon. But let us note that his speech emphasized America's defenses; it was not concerned with what I believe is a great mistake in judgment. For I think it is a great mistake in judgment to think that we strengthen America's defenses by supplying great amounts of military aid to totalitarian nations in the world. I do not believe we can rely upon them in a critical hour. I believe they are dragging on our political and our economic and our diplomatic legs.

Therefore, Mr. President, once again I intend to vote for strong defense for America and strong defense for the other democracies of the world. But I will not vote to give to totalitarian nations the dollars of Oregon taxpayers and of the taxpayers of the other States of the United States.

Thus, Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on South American Relations, of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, next week I shall raise some questions in the course of my speech. For instance, what about military aid to South American countries? What returns have we received or can we expect to receive, and what is the comparative value of that kind of expenditure or what would flow if we exported American investments to South America and helped build up the economic productive power of the people of South America? I happen to be one who believes that as we build up the economic productive power of people in the areas of the world that have to be brought over to the side of freedom, we enhance the chances of the establishment of democratic governments.

The sad fact is that totalitarian governments best thrive when they are able to follow a military dominance over their people and bring the welfare of the people to a very low economic level.

Mr. President, I wanted to raise my voice in protest today over John Foster Dulles' conduct in the Middle East, because I am satisfied it is very much against the best security interests of my

country. I repeat what I have said so much: We need to do something, and do it quickly, to stop this great trend in foreign policy toward executive government in this country and return foreign policy to the people of the United States, where it belongs, because, under the Constitution, foreign policy does not belong to Dwight D. Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles. Foreign policy belongs to the people of this country, and the President and Secretary of State are but the administrators of the people's foreign policy. We do not now have a people's foreign policy for the simple reason that government by secrecy under the Eisenhower administration has gone so far that the people do not know very much about their country's foreign policy.

So when we sit in the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, as I did a few days ago, and seek to ascertain some facts from the Secretary of State about American foreign policy on several points, what are we told? The Secretary pleads executive privilege. He can. I know that under the Constitution, the separation of powers doctrine, if the Secretary wants to plead executive privilege when we want to find out about something in the Gaither Report, when we want to learn what were the differences between the Secretary and Governor Stassen with regard to the disarmament objective, the Secretary can plead executive privilege. But, as I said, and repeat now, it is the administration's fifth amendment plea. They have the right to plead it, but I have the right, and in this instance the duty, to tell Senators why I think they are pleading it. I will tell my colleagues why I think this administration, in hearing after hearing, through witness after witness coming before Congressional committees, pleads executive privilege. They do not dare tell the American people the facts about American foreign policy, because if they did the American people, in a fortnight, would demand a change. But I think there is still time—I pray there is still time—to get that change in 1958 and 1960.

I close by saying to the American people, do your duty in 1958 by giving to us a majority in the Congress of the United States that will make it possible for us to put an effective check upon the foreign policies of this administration, and then in 1960 give us a President who will return foreign policy to the people of the United States.

STATEMENT ON SCHOOL BUDGET BY DR. WILLIAM G. CARR, OF NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the most influential educational group in America is the National Education Association, which has valiantly led the fight for many years in behalf of an adequate Federal aid-to-schools program.

Its executive secretary, Dr. William G. Carr, on January 27, 1958, made a most impressive statement over radio and television analyzing the inadequacies in the school-aid proposals of the President of the United States.

My wife, Maurine, and I—and Mrs. Neuberger is a former schoolteacher—listened attentively to Dr. Carr's presentation. Both of us thought at that time that the widest possible audience of Americans should hear his words with respect to the urgent need for fairly paid teachers and generously supported schools.

Inasmuch as the able senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has just introduced school legislation today, I feel this is a pertinent time to include Dr. Carr's effective statement in the body of the RECORD, and to emphasize that his proposals at the elementary and high-school levels will help to supplement the college scholarship recommendations made by the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

I endorse completely the specific program of the NEA, as outlined by Dr. William G. Carr.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement by the executive secretary of the National Education Association be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT REGARDING PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S SPECIAL MESSAGE ON EDUCATION, DELIVERED TO CONGRESS JANUARY 27, 1958

(By William G. Carr)

The National Education Association is glad that the President has again recognized that we must have better schools and that the Federal Government must help.

I am afraid, however, that the message greatly underestimates what needs to be done, and what the American people are ready and willing to do, in education.

If we really want to meet the challenge to American education, we must recognize the crucial importance of first-class teachers. We will never get enough first-class teachers until we pay salaries that compete for the best in business and industry.

Scholarships will help only if good teachers are available. Schools are not business institutions but they are the Nation's greatest producer of wealth. It is time for teachers to share more fully in the dividends they help to create. That is why the National Education Association is urging Federal funds to improve teachers' salaries and construct needed classrooms.

The first educational requirement of the space age is enough space in our schools so that every student may attend a full day in an uncrowded classroom with a thoroughly competent professional teacher. That is not too good or too costly a specification for building the future adult citizenship of the United States of America.

The administration proposals would provide very small expenditures to a few selected areas of education. The NEA calls for strengthening American education right across the board.

The NEA has supported Federal school construction legislation believing such Federal financial action was acceptable to the largest possible segment of the American public and hence most likely to be enacted. With an administration and Congress under the control of different political parties, the NEA has been willing to work for compromise measures which, although not adequate, would still be of some assistance. Now, confronted by new and dramatic evidence of need, the NEA proposes a program which represents more nearly what should now be done as a minimum. The NEA can no longer agree that small sums, short-range programs, and narrow objectives are sufficient to meet the current situation.

The NEA favors Federal funds for State-directed educational programs and services in all areas, including science and mathematics. In our judgment, a Federal decision to support any particular selected area of instruction carries with it some danger of Federal direction of State educational policy. On the other hand, general Federal support leaves the States free to decide how much stress to place on mathematics, or on science, or on other areas of instruction.

The NEA therefore urges substantial Federal undergirding of the financial structure of public education. The present base, limited largely to revenue from local property taxes or from State taxes, cannot fairly and efficiently reach the wealth and income of the entire Nation.

The NEA believes State education agencies should be allowed to allocate Federal funds between construction and teachers salaries. Both need help, but there are districts where one need outweighs the other.

The NEA's proposal is a Federal payment to the States of \$25 per child rising to \$100 per child within 5 years. This is still only a small share of the total cost of education, so the States and localities must also continue to exert their own best efforts.

ADVERSE IMPACT OF FEDERAL BUDGET ON NATURAL RESOURCE PROGRAMS IN UNITED STATES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am deeply concerned about the belief, clearly expressed in the budget submitted by the administration to Congress, that our Nation can achieve weapons equality with the Soviet Union only at the sacrifice of vital programs in natural resource conservation and development. There is no question that we are embarked on a vastly accelerated program to correct any inadequacies in the fields of rocketry and missiles. We all recognize the need for making up lost time in this sphere of our defenses.

However, the basic needs of the Nation for improved waterways, for navigation, for more irrigation and better water supplies, and for additional power supplies cannot be permitted to languish behind the walls of a fortress bristling with armaments. We know that the opponent whose lead we are attempting to overcome in missiles and satellites is not relaxing efforts to fully utilize its rivers. Rather, they are expanding programs so that the potential of vast rivers which drain the uplands of Russia and Siberia can be added to the total productive strength being amassed against the Free World. We know that the Soviets have 40 major hydroelectric projects under construction—4 of which will exceed the capacity of Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River, heretofore the world's largest power producer.

At this point I should like to digress briefly from the manuscript of my address to call to the attention of the Senate the very informative address delivered on the floor of the Senate several days ago by the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I believe it was one of the most instructive speeches I have ever heard since I became a Member of the Senate in January 1955.

The Senator from Louisiana described his extensive travels in Russia and in Siberia. During the course of that address the Senator from Louisiana emphasized at considerable length the

huge water-resource projects which he had seen under construction on such vast rivers in the Soviet Union as the Yenisei, the Volga, and the Angara.

The Senator from Louisiana stressed the fact that he saw turbines being built which will have nearly three times the capacity of some of the largest turbines in operation in the United States. I think his warning should give any of us pause if we think that we should abandon, in the interest of economy, the conservation and development of the marvelous rivers of the United States.

Reports are also heard of thousands of Chinese who swarm the banks of the Yangtze and Yellow Rivers, virtually using their bare hands to erect new and extensive irrigation and power facilities. Thus, we are given a challenge from Communist lands not only in terms of military strength but in terms of how natural resources are used to increase national strength. We cannot overlook the necessity for modern weapons, but we must also recognize that the outcome of the race may eventually be determined by who displays the greater wisdom in development of resources.

In my opinion, our position suffered a severe setback when the President's budget message revealed that not a single new flood-control, navigation, irrigation, water-supply, or power project would be undertaken by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation in the coming fiscal year. Certainly, such a policy is not responsive to the needs of our expanding population, nor does it reflect an understanding of the critical situation which confronts us. It is neither wise nor true economy.

Where would we have been during World War II without the Grand Coulee water power which made possible the aluminum production for 50,000 planes a year? In that era of crisis the dams of TVA stoked the Oak Ridge atomic plant, while Grand Coulee and Bonneville provided the storehouse of energy needed for the Hanford plutonium works. This Nation cannot afford to put its water-resource-development requirements in the deep freeze for a single day, let alone the year-long moratorium proposed by the administration. We are all hopeful that our lag in missile defenses will be overcome within the coming year. But what if it is not? Will we then be called upon to accept further delay and curtailment, while the Soviets and Red China race ahead with expansion of their water resources?

SUPPORT GIVEN TO INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

Mr. President, in the 3 years that I have served in this body, I believe I have supported as unstintingly as anyone here the expensive and often unpopular programs which are necessary to maintain our Nation's security and our international position in the modern world. I have voted for defense budgets and increases in defense budgets. I have supported the mutual-security program, the technical-assistance program, and the United States information program. I have done so wholly in disregard of any partisan or political considerations. For

nothing has been a more frequent and easy target for attack and for criticism in our time than the substantial annual expenditures which we have found necessary—for the first time in supposed peacetime—to carry on international programs essential to our national interests as well as to the ultimate victory of freedom in the world.

I am convinced that the majority of men and women in Oregon are ready to undertake the burdens of these programs, however reluctantly, as the administration constantly exhorts them to do. But, Mr. President, the administration totally misreads the state of public opinion if they think that people will support these expenditures on the basis that other Government programs in welfare and resource fields will be cut so as to avoid an overall increase in the budget. I submit that the opposite is the case. We have all had the experience, Mr. President, of the many letters which tell us that this or that worthy objective at home could be accomplished if only a billion dollars could be transferred to that objective out of the funds we spend abroad or send up in the smoke of military activities. I predict we shall hear a good deal more of this from our constituents, in this year of declining economic prosperity in many parts of the country, if established or needed civilian programs of our Government are actually cut on the excuse of the greater security and international needs.

NATION NEEDS CONTINUING DOMESTIC PROGRESS

To the contrary, Mr. President, I believe that people are ready and willing to support these greater needs precisely to the degree that they are assured their Government will continue to look responsibly upon our domestic necessities. If the Nation as a whole must tighten its belt to meet the challenge of the great Soviet economic and scientific offensive throughout the world, let us tighten it on the civilian expenditures we all make in nonessential consumption of all kinds rather than on civilian Federal programs. For the fact is that those civilian Federal programs are far more essential to the present welfare of the Nation, and to its future strength, than whether those of us who might save a little in our Federal taxes have the money for \$27 billion worth of new cars this year, or new TV sets, or all the other consumption goods our Nation spends \$10 billion in advertising costs annually just to sell to ourselves.

This is true of Federal aid to education; of Federal aid to hospital construction; of Federal aid to medical research; of slum clearance and water-pollution control; and, above all, of Federal investment in resource development such as the building of new electric energy reserves in the Columbia River Basin. All of these add up to only a fraction of the security budgets, yet they are essential to our Nation and should continue to have the highest priority. Their continuation is the sine qua non of national support for those far greater defense and international expenditures which we know are necessary.

GOP HAS ALWAYS SOUGHT TO CURTAIL DOMESTIC PROGRAMS

The fact of course is that the administration is opposed to such civilian programs for their own sake. As a Republican administration, a self-styled "business administration," they opposed them before there was a crisis over sputnik, they oppose them now, and they will oppose them if the crisis should someday pass. They merely intend to use the very real needs of the present crisis as a cover behind which to carry out raids upon our programs for meeting our domestic responsibilities which have all along been the undeviating target of many Republican groups.

Mr. President, if by these steps backwards in the domestic field the administration manages to undermine and destroy public support for our national policies in the defense and international arena, they will have done double damage to our true national interests. In the end we could have neither domestic nor international programs equal to the tasks facing both. The President has slightly spoken of defense of our domestic programs as representing unwillingness to sacrifice. That is untrue and unjust. Rather, it is unwillingness to sacrifice in the wrong place and for the wrong reasons; for the people and the areas that would lose in the cutback of Federal civilian programs are those which are already in the most need and can afford to lose the least. If we are to have sacrifice, let it be where our society has the most fat to give up—in the fields of unessential consumption, but not in fields like health, education, resource development, and minimum decent living standards upon which our pride as a democracy and our future economic strength depend.

VIEWS SUBMITTED TO PRESIDENT BEFORE BUDGET WAS MADE

Mr. President, in making these comments on the administration's approach, as exemplified by the administration's budget, I do not simply express negative, ex post facto criticism. Actually, I submitted these same views in a letter to President Eisenhower while the budget was in preparation as long ago as last November 23.

Of course, I have no reason to believe the President ever saw my letter. It was rather a thorough letter—a little over 3 pages in length—and it asked a number of questions concerning the administration's approach to the budget which was then in the making, on matters which I thought and still think to be of great public interest, particularly to Oregon.

In reply to the letter, I received a brief note from the President's assistant, Mr. Sherman Adams, acknowledging it "for the President," and stating that my views had been "noted with interest" and would be given "consideration." There was no answer to any of the questions I had asked.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point my letter to President Eisenhower of November 23, 1957, and the reply from Governor Adams on December 4, 1957.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
November 23, 1957.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing you regarding the impact of the intensified defense programs, which you discussed in your speech of November 13, on Federal resource programs in the Pacific Northwest.

In the course of your Oklahoma City speech, which was broadcast nationally, you stated in part that the Government would have to scrutinize closely all its civilian programs, with a view to the elimination of programs which, "while desirable, are not absolutely essential." You stated your conclusions that, "while some savings may still be squeezed, savings of the kind we need can come about only through cutting out or deferring entire categories of activity."

This has been interpreted in the press and elsewhere as an announcement that the administration will propose cutbacks in the civilian sector of Federal programs and activities. For Oregon, such an announcement has at once been taken to mean that the administration will further resist prosecution of long-planned Federal water resource developments in the Columbia River Basin. Most immediately, the fate of the John Day project in 1958 is feared to be at stake in your quoted statement. I, therefore, write in the hope that you may be able to reassure the people of this State and region that Federal programs of vital importance to them will not be further cut back by the administration. Specifically, I urge that the full amount which the Corps of Engineers can effectively use in the construction of John Day Dam on the Columbia River—I believe \$30 million—be included in the budget for fiscal 1959 which you will present to the Congress early next year.

These are some of my reasons for urging such a course:

1. Rather than justifying the sacrifice of Federal resource development, our newly intensified competition with the Soviet Union is cause for accelerating such basic additions to national productive strength as the vast remaining hydroelectric potential of the Columbia River system. Energy is a fundamental measure of national strength—perhaps the most fundamental. During World War II, the hydroelectric energy generated at Bonneville and Grand Coulee on the Columbia contributed greatly to America's production of 50,000 airplanes a year. It made possible the Hanford atomic works. In any future crisis in national security, immense demands will unquestionably be made on American energy resources. Full and well-planned development of the power potential of the Columbia Basin, far from being a dispensable luxury, would add a margin of safety to the Nation's energy reserves, energy in a form which cannot be obtained overnight after the need for it becomes obvious and desperate.

2. The fundamental significance of energy resources for national strength is fully recognized by those with whom we compete. On its own vast rivers, the Soviet Union is engaged in building as many as 40 new power projects, several of them larger than even our own Grand Coulee. Though far poorer than the United States, the U. S. S. R. is doing this while simultaneously achieving its spectacular successes with rockets, missiles and the artificial earth satellites.

We have repeatedly been warned that communism's ability to accomplish a rapid, forced-draft industrial revolution in a backward country constitutes its greatest tempta-

tion to other undeveloped nations. Mr. Khrushchev has challenged the United States to meet the Soviet Union on this ground. To demonstrate that we can do so is as great a challenge as that posed by Soviet scientific and weapons development. How would the mighty United States look abroad, if we admit that we can match Soviet accomplishments only at the cost of sacrificing at home the kind of basic economic and social programs which are the goals and aspirations of the nations now choosing between communism and democracy?

3. It may well be that some sacrifices will have to be made by our Nation as a whole, as we shift more of our national effort into meeting the needs and the responsibilities which aggressive Soviet competition imposes upon us. But such a shift, in a nation devoting vast portions of its economy to automobiles, television sets, entertainment, liquor, and tobacco should surely come out of the top margin of unessential and luxury consumption, not out of public programs for developing basic economic strength and for underwriting minimum social standards. I trust, therefore, that your November 13 speech did not intend the widely held inference that precisely such programs are to be cut back to make room for greater military appropriations within preconceived budget limits.

For, particularly with respect to water-power development, is it the administration's position that the Nation cannot afford to build both missiles and dams? Then all dam construction should be halted, not only that of Federal projects. The allocation of the Nation's resources, in manpower, machinery, steel, cement, turbines and generators is about the same, whether the cost is raised by private-utility corporations or the Federal Government. Actually, of course, the contrary course is needed. The administration has in the past recognized the significance of waterpower projects for national strength by granting fast tax-write-off privileges which have been defended precisely as emergency measures to induce a shift of national resources into such projects. Will the administration, then, defend the position that private corporations in the United States can afford to build these great, needed power projects, such as John Day, but the Federal Government cannot?

I should very much appreciate a clarification of these questions raised by your November 13 speech, which have caused much concern in Oregon. Let me, in conclusion, summarize the issue implicit in this speech.

In your same address on November 13, you also took pains to stress the importance of not seeking savings for defense purposes by cutting the equally important mutual-security program. As I believe you know, I have consistently supported the requests of your administration both for authority and for funds in the pursuit of the defense and international policies of the United States, including the controversial foreign-aid and USIA programs. I have done so in the face of considerable public criticism, largely from members of your own political party in Oregon, because these are not popular expenditures.

Nevertheless, you and members of your administration have often stated that Americans must be prepared for heavy burdens of national security and of international leadership for the indefinite future. I am sure they would be prepared to assume these burdens as a necessary and unavoidable addition to the total national effort, domestic and international. They will not support such increased international programs if they are to serve as an excuse for abandoning economic and social undertakings which play vital roles in the domestic development and welfare of our own country.

The Nation as well as the Northwest needs the lowest cost power the Columbia River can

provide, for national strength as well as for the prosperity of this region. Will the administration tell the people of Oregon that, to build the missiles we need, their Government cannot afford to build dams like John Day—but private-utility corporations can?

I hope they will not be asked to support the new programs of which you spoke November 13 on such a basis. Particularly, I hope you can offer the assurance that the administration plans full progress on construction of the Federal John Day project on the Columbia River, a start on which was provided by the Congress in the current fiscal year.

Respectfully yours,
RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 4, 1957.
The Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: For the President, this will acknowledge your letter of November 23. Your comments and suggestions with reference to the resources program in the Pacific Northwest have been noted with interest.

Consideration will be given to the matters you have emphasized.

Sincerely,
SHERMAN ADAMS,
The Assistant to the President.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, sentiment in the State of Oregon does not favor the administration's decision to freeze vitally needed navigation, flood control, power, and irrigation projects. This attitude is summarized, I think, in an editorial in the Oregonian, the Pulitzer prize-winning newspaper which supported President Eisenhower in the campaigns of 1952 and 1956. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, the thoughtful Oregonian editorial, dated December 30, 1957.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO KINDS OF UNITED STATES MONEY

As Members of Congress assemble next week in Washington, D. C., they will be looking for opportunities to cut Federal expenditures to offset the almost certain additions to the defense budget. Public works offer tempting targets, but the lawmakers should take care to make a distinction between projects that pay their own way and those that don't. The former are really income-producing investments, not expenditures.

A case in point is the Federal hydroelectric system in the Columbia Basin. As of last June 30, Congress had appropriated approximately \$1,840,000,000 for all power projects in the Columbia system. And as of that date, \$226,624,704 had been returned to the Treasury to apply on the principal, nearly \$30 million ahead of schedule. Interest paid on the Government funds was \$161,718,044.

This does not take into consideration, of course, the tremendous cash benefits accruing to the Government through increased taxes paid by individuals and industries which depend on the federally generated power.

The Nation has been made richer, not poorer, by Federal investment in the Columbia River power system.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, local agencies of government and business and civic organizations reflect a similar viewpoint to that of the Oregonian. During the Congressional recess, I had an opportunity to meet with

members of many of these fine organizations in Oregon which have a deep understanding of water-resource problems and the need for progress in this field to assure continued economic advancement. One such group, the Willamette Basin Project Committee, has been working effectively for over two decades to accomplish a comprehensive control of rivers and streams in that watershed. At its meeting on December 4, 1957, this bipartisan committee adopted resolutions urging continuation and expansion of the development program. I was the annual-luncheon speaker on this occasion. So that the Members of Congress may be apprised of the project requirements believed to be essential by this outstanding group, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the wise and forceful resolutions adopted at the December meeting of the Willamette Basin Project Committee.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the disposition of water development projects should be based upon long-time fulfillment of objectives to be desired from the standpoint of economy, conservation of resources, and reduction of flood damage; to be determined after evaluation of the basis of expected benefits ratio and consequent ability to repay, supported by projection of benefits to be derived from stabilization of soil and water resources and by elimination of irreparable losses from floods and erosion; and

Whereas, commensurate compliance with the above provisions, augmented by cooperation and active participation of those landowners who must ultimately bear the expense, should yield a more just and comprehensive evaluation of any project, rather than relying on the outcome of other projects that were engineered to meet and be adaptable to entirely different and divergent conditions; and

Whereas proponents of the Red Prairie (Mill Creek) project in northern Polk County, believing that development to be ideally qualifying and justifying immediate attention, are asking for an engineering and reconnaissance report on the practicability of storage and use of flood waters of Mill Creek by authorized agencies at the earliest opportunity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Willamette Basin Project Committee assembled in annual meeting this 4th day of December 1957, at Eugene, Ore., does hereby approve and urge evaluation of the Red Prairie project by appropriate agencies as soon as practicable, and that copies of this resolution be sent to the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the State water resources board, and to Members of the Oregon delegation in Congress.

WILLAMETTE BASIN PROJECT
COMMITTEE,

ELMO B. CHASE, *Chairman*.

WALTER F. BUSE,

Chairman of Resolutions Committee.

Whereas a reregulating dam on the South Santiam at Foster would replace the White Bridge Dam below Green Peter; and

Whereas, Foster Dam would add about 30,000 acre-feet to flood storage; and

Whereas, the Foster Dam could also act as a reregulating dam for the Cascadia Dam and allow power to be installed in the Cascadia Dam: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this meeting of the Willamette Basin Project Committee, this 4th day of December 1957, at Eugene, Ore., go on record as requesting the Corps of Engi-

neers and the Congressional delegation to make the above substitution and secure authorization and planning funds.

WILLAMETTE BASIN PROJECT
COMMITTEE,

ELMO B. CHASE, *Chairman*.

WALTER F. BUSE,

Chairman of Resolutions Committee.

Whereas better and additional water records are now available; and

Whereas, a portion of the Amazon floods have been released into the Fern Ridge Reservoir: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Willamette Basin Project Committee, meeting this 4th day of December 1957, at Eugene, Ore., does hereby urge the Congress of the United States to authorize an increase in the storage capacity of Fern Ridge Reservoir by at least 15,000 acre-feet and does urge the engineers to follow through with the construction as promptly as possible.

WILLAMETTE BASIN PROJECT
COMMITTEE,

ELMO B. CHASE, *Chairman*.

WALTER F. BUSE,

Chairman of Resolutions Committee.

Whereas there have been very damaging floods on the South Santiam in the last several years; and

Whereas the Corps of Engineers estimate that it will require 535,000 acre-feet to give adequate protection; and

Whereas Green Peter Dam on the Middle Fork of the Santiam is the only one authorized: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this meeting of the Willamette Basin Project Committee, this 4th day of December, 1957, at Eugene, Ore., go on record as requesting the Congressional delegation to secure the authorization and planning funds for Cascadia and Wiley Creek Dams.

WILLAMETTE BASIN PROJECT
COMMITTEE,

ELMO B. CHASE, *Chairman*.

WALTER F. BUSE,

Chairman of Resolutions Committee.

Whereas with the construction of a reregulating dam below the Cougar Dam the power generated by the dam and reregulating dam could be increased from about 25,000 kilowatts installed to almost 50,000 kilowatts installed; and

Whereas power in this area is badly needed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this meeting of the Willamette Basin Project Committee, this 4th day of December, 1957, at Eugene, Ore., go on record as favoring the construction of the Strube Dam as a reregulating dam for Cougar and urge the Congressional delegation to secure its authorization and planning funds.

WILLAMETTE BASIN PROJECT
COMMITTEE,

ELMO B. CHASE, *Chairman*.

WALTER F. BUSE,

Chairman of Resolutions Committee.

Whereas snags and roots of trees clog the flow of the Willamette and McKenzie Rivers at many points; and

Whereas there are many low places along the banks where floodwaters overflow the banks and damage adjacent land; and

Whereas the regulation of the dams tends to keep the flow of the river a little higher than normal: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this meeting of the Willamette Basin Project Committee, this 4th day of December 1957, at Eugene, Ore., go on record as asking the Congressional delegation for the authorization of levees and channel clearance along the Willamette

River down to the mouth of the Long Tom and along the McKenzie River from Hendricks Bridge to the mouth, and also to secure planning funds so that construction can begin as soon as possible.

WILLAMETTE BASIN PROJECT
COMMITTEE,

ELMO B. CHASE, *Chairman*.

WALTER F. BUSE,

Chairman of Resolutions Committee.

Whereas the present plan for flood control on the McKenzie River, including Gate Creek, would only take care of 34 percent of the total drainage area; and

Whereas the third dam (Gate Creek) has never been authorized: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Willamette Basin Project Committee, meeting this 4th day of December 1957, at Eugene, Ore., urge the Congressional delegation to secure authorization of the Gate Creek Dam and allocate planning funds to start it in the very near future.

WILLAMETTE BASIN PROJECT
COMMITTEE,

ELMO B. CHASE, *Chairman*.

WALTER F. BUSE,

Chairman of Resolutions Committee.

Whereas the Molalla Basin has received phenomenal growth in population since 1938; and

Whereas there has been considerable clearing along the banks, as well as farming, and structures built; and

Whereas there has been increased damage due to these facts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this meeting of the Willamette Basin Project Committee, this 4th day of December 1957, at Eugene, Ore., go on record as requesting Congress to approve and the Corps of Engineers to make a complete survey of the Molalla Basin in the interests of flood control.

WILLAMETTE BASIN PROJECT
COMMITTEE,

ELMO B. CHASE, *Chairman*.

WALTER F. BUSE,

Chairman of Resolutions Committee.

Whereas the locks at Oregon City are more than 80 years old; and

Whereas they are too narrow for regular barge traffic; and

Whereas present locks are composed of several basins causing them to be slow in operation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Willamette Basin Project Committee, meeting this 4th day of December 1957, at Eugene, Ore., urge the Congressional delegation to secure planning funds so that reconstruction can proceed in the near future.

WILLAMETTE BASIN PROJECT
COMMITTEE,

ELMO B. CHASE, *Chairman*.

WALTER F. BUSE,

Chairman of Resolutions Committee.

Whereas the principle of supremacy of State water laws in deriving rights to the ownership, distribution, and use of ground and surface waters has been recognized in States lying wholly or partly west of the 98th principal meridian by both Federal laws and State law, and the enabling acts by which many of the States were admitted to the Union; and

Whereas the stability of the economy, the property values, and the continued peace, prosperity, and development of much of the whole United States is dependent on a continued recognition of the supremacy of State water laws and the property rights which have been derived and settled thereunder: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Willamette Basin Project Committee, in session at Eugene, Ore., this

4th day of December 1957, That this committee urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will reconfirm the sovereignty of the Western States over the appropriation and use of water and which will prevent the Federal Power Commission from licensing power projects without full compliance by the licensee with State laws regulating the appropriation and use of water; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary to each member of Oregon's delegation in Congress and to the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs.

WILLAMETTE BASIN PROJECT
COMMITTEE,

ELMO B. CHASE, *Chairman*.

WALTER F. BUSE,

Chairman of Resolutions Committee.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, start of new projects also is sought by the chambers of commerce, labor, and other groups in the State of Oregon. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions from the Lane County Chamber of Commerce, the Sweet Home-East Linn County Chamber of Commerce, and the Maritime Trades Department of the AFL-CIO Port Council of Portland and vicinity.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING OF THE LANE COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE HELD AT JAMISON'S CAFE, OAKRIDGE, OREG., DECEMBER 17, 1957

Whereas the United States Army Corps of Engineers is constructing the Cougar Dam project for flood control, power, and recreational benefits; and

Whereas the present engineering plan is for power installation of 25,000 kilowatts to operate as a base load powerplant; and

Whereas the present design does not adequately protect the recreational benefits by downstream regulations of streamflow: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Corps of Engineers be asked to give favorable consideration to the modification of the design of the power features of the project to provide for installation of additional generating capacity at Cougar Dam powerhouse operating the powerplant as a peaking plant and that the project be also modified to add the strube regulation reservoir with control in waterflows and thereby provide more complete utilization of the water resources and that the foregoing resolution be sent to the office of the Portland district and the North Pacific division, Corps of Engineers, and members of the Oregon Congressional delegation.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING OF THE LANE COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE HELD AT JAMISON'S CAFE, OAKRIDGE, OREG., DECEMBER 17, 1957

Whereas the United States Army Corps of Engineers is engaged in constructing Hills Creek Reservoir project; and

Whereas the money appropriated for construction in the fiscal year 1958 has been determined as insufficient for optimum and economic construction progress: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Portland district's North Pacific division and Chief of Engineers be requested to allocate sufficient additional funds to provide for the most economic prosecution of the construction at the project and that the foregoing resolution be sent to the various Corps of Engineers offices and the Oregon Congressional delegation.

SWEET HOME-EAST LINN COUNTY
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Sweet Home, Oreg., January 10, 1958.
The Honorable RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NEUBERGER: The Sweet Home-East Linn County Chamber of Commerce entreats you to lend all possible support to the acquisition of construction funds for the Green Peter Dam on the South Santiam River.

This dam has been approved both by the Congress and the United States Army engineers as a vital installation of the Willamette Basin flood-control project.

Immediate commencement of construction would be advantageous to both the Army engineers and the Linn County area. Unemployment is high and this area is suffering an economic slump.

The devastating erosion of valuable and irreplaceable Willamette Valley farmland continues unchecked.

Respectfully yours,

JESS M. PARKER, *President.*

RESOLUTION OF MARITIME TRADES DEPARTMENT, AFL-CIO, PORT COUNCIL OF PORTLAND AND VICINITY

Whereas for over 20 years there has been approved legislation to widen and deepen the Columbia and Willamette Rivers up to the ports of Vancouver, Wash., and Portland, Oreg.; and

Whereas this has never been lived up to since it was authorized: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the maritime trades department do everything within its power to help bring about the deepening and widening of these rivers so that any type ship can navigate in these channels at all times; be it further

Resolved, That we request our friends in the United States Senate and Congress to help us in any way they can to make the port of Portland, Oreg., and the port of Vancouver, Wash., available to any and all ocean-going traffic.

RESOLUTION OF MARITIME TRADES DEPARTMENT, AFL-CIO, PORT COUNCIL OF PORTLAND AND VICINITY

Whereas during the last several years, the port of Portland has had in operation a surplus drydock of the Navy, capable of handling the ships of larger tonnage entering the Columbia River; and

Whereas many firms, large and small, at the risk of their capital, established a very efficient ship-repair operation in this port, including the conversion of two large passenger ships, which would have been impossible without this type of drydock; and

Whereas the State of Oregon has been declared a critical area because of unemployment, and ship repair in the port of Portland has developed payrolls into millions; and

Whereas the necessary ship repair, including this type of drydock, will have much bearing on the type of tonnage used in hauling wheat and general cargoes out of the Columbia River, which is of vital interest to the seamen sailing these ships: Be it

Resolved, That the maritime trades department and its affiliates seek the support of all other groups and individuals in this matter; and be it finally

Resolved, That the maritime trades department forward this resolution, with personal letters, to all Senators and Congressmen and any other interested parties, urging them to use their influence in helping the port of Portland retain this drydock for operations in the port of Portland.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a newspaper col-

umn by A. Robert Smith from the East Oregonian, of Pendleton, Oreg., telling of the opinions of Maj. Gen. E. C. Itschner, Chief of the Corps of Army Engineers, on Russian dam-building progress.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDS BUILDING BIG DAMS WHILE UNITED STATES SITS ON FENCE
(By Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—Russia is now completing a big hydroelectric project which will be 18 percent greater in kilowatt production than America's biggest dam, Grand Coulee, according to Maj. Gen. E. C. Itschner, Chief of the Army Engineers.

This is just one of 17 dams being built to fully develop the mighty Volga River from the Arctic on the north to the Black and Caspian Seas on the south.

"It is clear that the Russians are well aware of the importance of complete river basin development and are carrying forward an extensive program, in addition to the expansion of their armed forces," General Itschner declared.

"Comprehensive development on the Volga, which has pushed forward largely since World War II, already has provided the 3,000-mile main stem of an integrated inland waterway system," Itschner added.

DEFENSE AND RIVER DEVELOPMENT

The Chief of Engineers, by outlining progress of Russia in resource development, tended to bolster the argument being advanced by those who contend that the United States need not sacrifice river development work in order to step up defense spending. The National Rivers and Harbors Congress and Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrat of Oregon, recently made such an argument in opposition to reported decisions by the Eisenhower administration to invoke a "no new starts" policy on public works development and oppose authorization of new river and harbor projects.

On another front, Mike Straus, Ex-Commissioner of Reclamation, is working up a report of Russian resource programs for the Senate Interior Committee as ammunition for western Senators who anticipate a tough battle for funds for reclamation and power projects.

General Itschner said he thinks it significant that Russia has given the United States a glimpse of its military advancements while remaining reticent about disclosing the advancements they are making on the economic front.

"Possibly the Russians hope we will become so overburdened by the costs of defense as to neglect our own economic development, while at the same time they build up their own real strength," the general speculated.

DEVELOPMENTS CITED

Itschner cited these Russian developments:

1. Each of the 17 dams on the Volga will have good-sized navigation locks possibly as large as 100 by 1,000 feet. Vessels of 11.5-foot draft regularly travel the approximately 1,000 miles between Moscow and the Black and Caspian Seas.

2. The big dam that surpasses Grand Coulee will be finished in 1958 with a capacity of 2,300,000 kilowatts. Russia has plans for even bigger dams in Siberia, 3 of them ranging in output from 3 million to 5 million kilowatts. Installed capacity of Grand Coulee is about 1,900,000 kilowatts.

Some proposed projects in Alaska would come close to rivaling the Russian dams—mainly the Rampart Dam which has been proposed for the Yukon River by the Bureau of Reclamation. It would have a capacity of 3 million kilowatts, unless Canada should

divert part of the flow of the Yukon as has been proposed. The Taiya project in southeastern Alaska would have an installed capacity of 2 million kilowatts. There is no active consideration being given to building either of these Alaska dams.

RUSSIAN PORT FACILITIES IMPROVED

3. Russia is emphasizing the mechanization of port facilities.

4. Marinas and beach areas are being developed for public recreation.

General Itschner conceded that Russia has made sacrifices to achieve both military and resource development accomplishments, but he noted that the sacrifices fell in the area of TV sets and swept-wing automobiles.

"I am confident that our country possesses the engineering skills and construction capability which, if rationally directed to the task, will give us the water resource developments required to build an economy which can meet any challenge the communistic world might offer," the Chief of Engineers concluded.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a few days ago I received a letter from a former colleague of ours in the Senate, the Honorable George H. Bender, who is now Special Assistant to the Secretary of Interior. The letter concerns the matter of statehood for Alaska, which has been considered by the Congress for many years, and so far not given too serious consideration upon the floor of the Senate.

My own personal point of view, which is in support of statehood for Alaska, is that it is high time we as Americans face up to this very vital issue. It seems to me that it is extremely important to this country in our relations with the rest of the world to make a decision in this matter and to let the rest of the world know that, as I hope and desire, we intend to make Alaska our next State or, at least, in the alternative and less to our credit, to tell the world what our intentions are with respect to Alaska.

If we are in fact going to push out our frontiers, as we have been doing, scientifically, and if we are to push them out geographically to the South Pole, it is also high time that we push them out to Alaska, and in that respect tell the world for once and for all we consider Alaska to be a part of the United States in the full sense of all that implies—and what it implies is statehood.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, in view of the very able manner in which this problem has been presented in the letter of former Senator Bender, that the letter be printed as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., January 23, 1958.
Hon. GORDON ALLOTT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: As the 85th session of the 85th Congress begins its momentous task, this letter of greeting and good wishes comes to you from our country's most important 20th century frontier, the Territory of Alaska.

In my capacity as special assistant to Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton, I have been accorded the opportunity of studying at first hand the people, the geography, the military significance, and the potential development of this underdeveloped outpost of America.

During this session of Congress you will undoubtedly consider once more the question of statehood for Alaska. I believe with all sincerity that the grant of statehood to Alaska would furnish definitive evidence to the people of our country and to the world that while we are acutely aware of the military problems we face, we are taking every step possible to insure the preservation of the traditional rights and privileges of our citizens wherever located.

We are all aware that the consideration of Alaskan statehood in the past has raised political questions. Some people, too, are concerned over the fact that the soil of Alaska is not physically contiguous to other parts of the United States. But, in these days when artificial satellites soar overhead with complete disregard for established national boundaries or continental limits, these issues appear to have become obsolete.

The statehood legislation now pending before Congress contains adequate provisions to meet the requirements of the defense efforts in Alaska. It is my considered judgment that Alaska holds the key to the military security of the United States. Its strategic location in this era of missiles, supersonic flight, and pushbutton warfare has enhanced Alaska's already established status as a radar warning center, as an air defensive core, and as a protective arsenal for the entire Western Hemisphere.

Alaskans have readily accepted the provisions in the statehood bill which will permit the Military Establishment to act under the President in times of emergency while at the same time adequately protecting their personal and property rights.

You may be sure that in the work which lies before you during the difficult days ahead you have the support and the prayers of the American people and people everywhere who seek for world peace under the blessings of freedom. The admission of Alaska into the Union could well be the symbol we need to assure the peoples of the world of our continued adherence to the principles of our forefathers.

It is in this spirit that I address you and wish you a most successful session.

Very sincerely yours,

GEORGE H. BENDER,
Special Assistant to the Secretary.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I sincerely hope that during the present session of Congress the Senate of the United States will consider and debate the question of statehood for Alaska, so that it can be determined and settled once and for all. It is a question which we cannot avoid longer. It is a question which, if not decided, will result inevitably in damage to our own prestige and that of the great Territory of Alaska. It is my firm hope that the matter will be decided in the affirmative, and that we can welcome Alaska as a State.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to concur in the support of statehood for Alaska which has been voiced by the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. NEUBERGER. As one of the ardent adherents of statehood for Alaska and one of the Senators from the Pacific Northwest, which is the nearest United

States area to Alaska, I am grateful for the sentiments the Senator has voiced.

Mr. President, if no other Member desires to address the Senate, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YARBOROUGH in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk an order, and ask for its immediate consideration. I invite the attention of the occupant of the Chair to the provisions of the order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order will be read.

The order was read, as follows:

Ordered, That Mr. CARROLL be, and he is hereby, excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Public Works, and assigned to service on the Committee on the Judiciary.

That Mr. YARBOROUGH be, and he is hereby, assigned to service on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order is entered.

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, January 31, 1958, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 30 (legislative day of January 27), 1958:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

U. Alexis Johnson, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Thailand.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Anthony F. Arpaia, of Connecticut, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1964.

Rupert L. Murphy, of Georgia, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1964.

Abe McGregor Goff, of Idaho, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term expiring December 31, 1959.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

To be rear admiral

Capt. Richard M. Ross for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral.

The following-named persons for appointment to the rank indicated with their respective names:

The following-named persons to be captains in the United States Coast Guard:

Alvin H. Giffin	Emmet T. Calahan
James A. Alger, Jr.	John H. Forney
Albert J. Carpenter	Eugene A. Coffin, Jr.
Willard J. Smith	David O. Reed

Edward W. Laird
Verne C. Gibson
Charles R. Montelro
Hugh D. Wear
Daniel J. Lucinski
Hubert R. Chaffee
Peter J. Smenton
Thomas R. Midtlyng
John B. Oren
Harry E. Davis, Jr.

Joseph Howe
George W. Holtzman
William W. Childress
John H. Wagline
John J. Hutson, Jr.
Robert E. McCaffery
Albert E. Harned
Richard F. Rea
Louis M. Thayer, Jr.

The following-named persons to be commanders in the United States Coast Guard:

Daniel C. Dickert	William E. Chapline
Lloyd R. Morrison	Albert Frost
Cyril L. Heyliger	William F. Adams
Frank F. Elliott	William F. Rea III
Henry C. Keene, Jr.	James L. Lathrop
Ellis L. Perry	Vincent J. Cass
Loy W. A. Renshaw	Austin C. Wagner
Cecil E. Meree, Jr.	Stephen G. Carkeek
Clyde L. Olson	Norman L. Horton
Joseph G. Bastow, Jr.	Henry A. Pearce, Jr.
Bob Kirsten	William A. Jenkins
John B. Speaker, Jr.	John Natwig
Louis F. Sudnik	Roy M. Hutchins, Jr.
John F. Thompson, Jr.	

The following-named persons to be lieutenant commanders in the United States Coast Guard:

Stephen Varanko	David W. DeFreest
John R. Mackey	Robert L. Lawlis
Joseph F. Furlough, Jr.	James W. Dodson
Ottis H. Abney	George D. Winstein
Curtis H. Jurgens	William W. Richter
Allen E. Armstrong	John A. Corso
Charles D. Budd	William H. St. George
Howard A. Linse	George T. Treffs
Harry E. Chapin	Robert J. Bloxson
James McMenamin	Joseph W. Finnegan
Donby J. Mathieu	

The following-named persons to be lieutenants in the United States Coast Guard:

Jack A. Howell	Arthur W. Gove
Russell P. Combs	George J. Weidner
William E. Heath	Carl E. Rodehau
Justin J. Bonanno	Raymond W. Bernhard
Lenard Fielding, Jr.	Edward S. Davis, Jr.
John F. O'Connor	Robert C. Pittman
Richard A. Bauman	

The following-named persons to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the United States Coast Guard:

Domenic A. Calicchio	James N. Schenk
William Drew	John H. Guest

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be lieutenant commanders

Dewey G. Rushford
Steven L. Hollis, Jr.

To be lieutenants

Clinton D. Upham
Floyd J. Tucker, Jr.
Dale E. Westbrook

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Albert Larsen, Jr., effective February 9, 1958.	Paul L. Schock
Herman H. Druebert	Richard F. Shoolbred
Charles I. Harding	Robert D. Frost
James C. Sainsbury	Charles E. Fuller
Victor V. Tilley, Jr.	Philip J. Taetz
William M. Lee	Earl R. Scyoc
Arthur M. Cook	Ogden Beeman
Lawrence C. Haverkamp	Ronald D. Bernard
Thomas E. Simkin	K. William Jeffers
	Bernard L. Gabrielsen
	Oliver J. Weber
	Merlyn D. Christensen

To be ensigns

Jerome P. Guy
Leroy L. Pate
George F. Wirth

CIV—86

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 30, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

I Corinthians 13: 13: Now abideth faith, hope, and love, these three; but the greatest of these is love.

Almighty God, to turn away from Thee is to fail, but to abide in Thee is to stand fast forever.

We penitently confess that there is so much in our life which sorely perplexes us and we frequently wander in doubt and walk in darkness, uncertain of the way.

Grant that in our noonday prayer we may be lifted to larger outlooks, clearer visions, and new fields of endeavor.

May we daily grow in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour, whom to know aright is life eternal.

Inspire us with a victorious faith, an unconquerable hope, and a love that endures forever.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 728. An act to authorize the acquisition of certain property in square 724 in the District of Columbia for the purpose of extension of the site of the additional office building for the United States Senate or for the purpose of addition to the United States Capitol Grounds; and

S. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution providing additional funds for the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 5538) entitled "An act to provide that withdrawals, reservations, or restrictions of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. MALONE, and Mr. ALLOTT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the prayer of the Chaplain of the House today, always beautiful and effective, was most appropriate on this occasion: "Faith, hope, and charity." If there was ever a man who during his lifetime exemplified not only by words but by deeds those great spiritual elements it was the late Franklin D. Roosevelt. Today is the birthday anniversary of that great man, that great American, one of the greatest humanitarians of all time.

The service of any man as President of the United States is difficult of evaluation during his lifetime, and that applies to anyone who is the incumbent of the White House, because during his lifetime the emotions, the honest differences, the controversial questions that arise in the life of all of us and particularly in the life of a nation, and more particularly during the great historical period the world is now undergoing, obscure and prevent a true evaluation of the meaning and significance of the trend and type of leadership given by any man who occupies the office of Chief Executive of our Country.

I think it can be safely said without contradiction by even those who have disagreed with the late Franklin D. Roosevelt on some of his proposals and views and policies that he was a man of deep faith, a man who gave hope to others, and a man of charity.

He was a man who during his service as President laid the foundation for the great progress made in our country in recent years in the field of economic reconstruction and economic progress. Franklin D. Roosevelt assumed office in 1933 at a time when our country was in deep despair and when the people of our country—the great majority of them—were wondering whether democratic institutions of government could function. Franklin D. Roosevelt brought to the people the leadership necessary to meet the trying problems resulting from a great economic conflagration. Franklin D. Roosevelt stepped into the breach and gave to the people of our country the leadership that brought back not only hope and faith but confidence which results from faith and hope. Without faith and hope, confidence cannot exist. Franklin D. Roosevelt recognized the right of others to disagree with him. Many did disagree with him, and honestly so. I am sure, as I said before, they will agree with me as to the sincerity of his purpose. Today we see the results of his leadership. No Member of the Congress has introduced a single bill to repeal any of the great progressive measures recommended by Franklin D. Roosevelt and passed by the Congress of the United States. As a matter of fact, we read constantly in the newspapers that we will never have another depression due to the cushions that exist in the law. What are some of those cushions? Social security, unemployment compensation, the Securities and Exchange Commission regulations protecting the investing public against the fraudulent sales of stock, the minimum wage, the elimination of exploitation of

child labor, the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, a very broadened law in relation to immigration and naturalization, and so many other pieces of legislation recommended by Franklin D. Roosevelt which are on the statute books which today constitute not only cushions against depression in the economic sphere but in the moral and idealistic sphere, which is very important. So, when we read in the papers about these cushions that will prevent another depression, they are all due to the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt and those of us who fought shoulder to shoulder with him for the passage of those great constructive and progressive measures. Today is the anniversary of his birth. As we paused yesterday to pay respects to another great President, a President elected as a Republican—you notice I say "a President elected as a Republican," for I recognize no President as either a Republican or a Democratic President—but, as I say, "a President elected as a Republican," today we pause to honor the memory of another great President, elected as a Democrat. In my opinion, the name and memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt will go down in history as one of the greatest figures on the constructive side of history. I do not know how much longer the known history of man will continue. Nobody can tell, looking into the future; but certainly, as we look at the past, down through the many hundreds of years of known history, Franklin D. Roosevelt stands out as one of the greatest figures of all times; and more particularly on the constructive side because he symbolized during his lifetime—and in office he gave the leadership that brought to countless millions of persons, the average person, hope, confidence, and a restoration of faith, not only to our own people but to the countless millions of average persons in other lands throughout the world.

To them Franklin D. Roosevelt and what he stood for during his lifetime will always be a symbol of hope and of confidence. It is well that we pause on this occasion to pay respects to this great man, this great American, this great President.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join in our tribute to Franklin Delano Roosevelt on the 76th anniversary of his birth.

The 13 years since Franklin Roosevelt's death have not dimmed his memory. It has been kept ablaze by the dreams which have become realities. It is reflected in the shining progress of our health programs, in the working conditions of our men and women, in the hopes of our American farmers, in the economic dignity given our citizens in their twilight years, and in our civil rights and liberties.

Franklin Roosevelt was first of all a great humanitarian. He proved it by fighting to the bitter end for the inalienable rights of his fellowmen.

But Franklin Roosevelt was also a shrewd and sagacious statesman, with a keen sense of world affairs. The qualities that made of Franklin Roosevelt a great humanitarian in no way diluted the substance needed to make of him a great Commander in Chief and a great world leader. He was a tower of strength in the long and painful war years and nonplused his bitterest critics with his tenacity and courage to make the kind of decisions that try men's souls.

HOLIDAY FOR F. D. R. BIRTHDAY

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, today we are commemorating the 76th anniversary of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's birthday.

For several years the International Association of Machinists have reprinted their editorial eulogizing the accomplishments of this great American. No doubt some day in the not too distant future, when another generation can compare the deeds and record of this great humanitarian with other statesmen, he will be placed along with Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln in the history books of our Nation.

The following editorial from the Machinists newspaper is a beautiful summary, setting out the reasons why Franklin Delano Roosevelt's birthday should be a national holiday:

Today Franklin Roosevelt occupies a place in our history beside George Washington and Abraham Lincoln as a leader who came to the American people in a time of great crisis and led them through.

We observe the birthday of Washington in every State and that of Lincoln in 31 States. Roosevelt's birthday, January 30, should be added to those two.

Most of us are not too young to remember the stark fear that faced this Nation in 1933. The United States was in the throes of a crisis unprecedented in times of peace. Most of all we needed something to restore our confidence. Franklin Roosevelt did that and more. He pulled us out of the crisis. As one historian has written, "The 99-day session of the 73d Congress that began on March 9, 1933, witnessed the most daring Presidential leadership in American history."

He followed in the middle thirties with a program of social legislation—social security, labor relations, home loans, bank deposit insurance, rural electrification, minimum wages—to name a few of the great New Deal laws.

Roosevelt gave the common people of America the chance for security and self-respect. During the second half of his administration, when we were plunged into the worst war in our history, Roosevelt led us to victory.

The forgotten man whom Roosevelt fought for can lead the way in making his birthday a national day of remembrance. National holidays can only be suggested by Congress. They must be officially proclaimed by State governors and local mayors. Any group has the right to petition a governor or mayor to proclaim a holiday.

Observance of Washington's and Lincoln's birthdays came slowly. Three months after Washington's death in 1799, Congress adopted a resolution urging a public noting of February 22. A few cities followed the suggestion in succeeding years, but it was not until the 100th anniversary of his birth that the entire country made the day a holiday.

In Lincoln's case also, Congress adopted a resolution urging observance of Lincoln's birthday. It was not until the 100th anniversary of his birth, that the observance became a national custom.

For 19 years we have been observing Roosevelt's birthday as National Infantile Paralysis Day. But his birthday must be remembered for more than the great personal handicap which he overcame.

Working men and women will gladly honor him on his birthday, as one of the greatest friends they ever had. His ideals deserve to be remembered this year and every year.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 320)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I request the Congress to enact legislation that will permit a continuation of the reciprocal trade agreements program on an effective basis for a minimum of 5 additional years past June 30, 1958.

The enactment of this legislation, unweakened by amendments of a kind that would impair its effectiveness, is essential to our national economic interest, to our security, and to our foreign relations.

The high importance of trade to our economy is evident. The income of our people arising from export trade alone approximates or exceeds that arising from many major segments of our economy. The development of a healthy export trade has created a significant number of jobs for our working men and women. Imports furnish our industries with essential raw materials, and the benefits of technological advances add to the variety of goods available to our consumers, and also create jobs for our workers. Moreover, important geographical areas within our country, as well as many of our key industries in both manufacturing and agriculture, look to expanding world trade as an essential ingredient of their future prosperity.

Reciprocal trade agreements negotiated since the advent of the Trade Agreements Act have helped bring a more vigorous, dynamic growth to our American economy. Our own economic self-interest, therefore, demands a continuation of the trade agreements program. Under this program sound two-way trade can be further developed to assure to our industries widening opportunities for participation in world markets and to provide foreign nations the opportunity to earn the dollars to pay for the goods we sell. We can either receive the benefits of the reciprocal lowering of trade barriers or suffer the inevitable alternative of increasingly high barriers against our own commerce which would weaken our economy and jeopardize American jobs.

Important as growing international trade is to our country, it is equally important to our allies and trading partners. For them it is indeed vital to the health and growing strength of their economies, on which their political stability and military power heavily depend. The assured future of the reciprocal-trade

program is necessary for our national security and for our entire foreign policy.

In particular, it is essential to enable us to meet the latest form of economic challenge to the free world presented by communism. In the state of the Union message, I spoke of the economic offensive that has been mounted against free nations by the Communist imperialists. The Soviet Union is engaged in an intensive effort, through combined programs of trade and aid, to divide the countries of the free world, to detach them one by one and swing them into the orbit of Communist influence.

We must recognize the growing capacity of the Soviet Union in the economic field. Their advances in technology and industrialization, together with their continuing repression of domestic consumption, enable them to supply, better than ever before, the machinery, manufactures, and other goods which are essential to the economic life of many countries.

The Soviet capacity to export is matched by its capacity and willingness to import. It is increasingly offering to import the surpluses of non-Communist states. In this way it seeks to tie such states to the Soviet orbit, and to exploit the trade difficulties of the free world.

This challenge in the economic field cannot be ignored without the gravest risk to our own way of life. This fact alone makes it imperative that previous positions be reexamined, and that particular interests be reappraised in the light of overriding national needs.

The question is whether the system of free competitive enterprise for which we stand will meet successfully in the international economic arena the challenge hurled by the Soviet leaders.

We will fail in this endeavor if the free countries do not continue their reduction of the barriers which they themselves impose on their trade with each other. We will fail if closed markets and foreign exchange shortages force Free World countries into economic dependence upon the Communist bloc. We will fail if the United States should now abandon the task of building a world-trading system from which all Free World countries can gain strength and prosperity in a free economic society.

If our Government is to play its decisive part in protecting and strengthening the free economic system against the Communist threat, the trade agreements legislation which the administration is requesting of the Congress must be enacted.

The Secretary of Commerce, who is Chairman of the Trade Policy Committee which I recently established to advise and assist me in the administration of the trade-agreements program, including review of recommendations of the United States Tariff Commission, will transmit to the Congress the administration's legislative proposals. These proposals, including the various safeguards for domestic industry, will generally follow the pattern set by the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955.

The amount of tariff reduction authority to be requested is essential to the

continuing success of the program, as is the 5-year period of the proposed extension to the continuity in our trade relations.

There is a further and very specific factor necessitating a minimum extension of 5 years. Six European nations, which purchased nearly \$3 billion of our exports last year, have established a European Economic Community which will become a common market with a population nearly as large as our own. These countries will ultimately have a common tariff applying to imports from the rest of the world. It is anticipated that important steps toward this common tariff will become effective during 1962—up to 4½ years from the renewal date of our trade-agreements legislation. This period must be devoted to negotiations with the new Economic Community and these negotiations must be preceded by painstaking preparations. Both preparation and negotiation must be based on a clear grant of adequate authority. This timetable requires an extension of the legislation for a minimum of 5 years. Such an extension, with the tariff-reduction authority to be requested, is necessary to carry the trade-agreements program through the early formative years of the European Economic Community and strengthen our ability to further vital American interests there and elsewhere in the world.

The 5-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act with broadened authority to negotiate is essential to America's vital national interests. It will strengthen our economy which is the foundation of our national security. It will enhance the economic health and strength of the Free World. It will provide a powerful force in waging total peace.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 30, 1958.

FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

THE SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL].

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 426) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1958, expenses of conducting the investigations authorized by section 17 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, incurred by the Committee on Un-American Activities, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$305,000, including expenditures for employment of such experts, special counsel, investigators, and such clerical, stenographic and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. That the official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings, if not otherwise officially engaged.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time not to ask for a rollcall; I have no intention of pressing for a rollcall, but I do take this opportunity to express my opposition to this continued expenditure of money, because I think today more than ever since this committee was organized it has outlived its usefulness. I want, therefore, at least to be on record as opposing this resolution.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker I disagree most emphatically with the gentleman from Minnesota. I want to say I am in favor of this amount of money for the Un-American Activities Committee. It is doing a wonderful job; the committee has justified its request for every penny; it should be continued in full operation; and as a member of the Committee on House Administration who supported this amount in our committee I urge the House to vote the full amount of \$305,000.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, one of the tragedies of our day is the fact that, in spite of all that has been written, there are only a comparatively few people, including the Supreme Court, who really understand the Communist mind, the Soviet objective of world domination, and the various methods employed to accomplish that objective.

We are presently at war with the Soviet Union. Military might is only one part of the offensive now being waged by the Communists against the Free World. The country and this Congress is almost in a state of shock over alleged military supremacy of the Communists. Russia is not going to sign its own death warrant by an all-out nuclear war in the foreseeable future, and why should she? The Communists are using a weapon more effective than guided missiles, namely, infiltration and internal subversion, by which she has in a few years brought approximately one-third of the surface of the earth and its peoples under her domination and control.

A great general said the other day that one of the very few remaining forces in the world that really understands this phase of the Communist offensive and is fighting it is the House Committee on Un-American Activities. It is almost unbelievable that there are some who would attempt to destroy this bulwark by depriving it of a pittance compared to the amount being spent to oppose aggression from without, which, as I have said, in all probability will never come.

The hard core of the Communist conspiracy, the ADA, the Communist-dominated Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, and the Washington Post have been conducting a well-planned campaign to handcuff and to eventually destroy the Committee on Un-American Activities. In an editorial 2 weeks ago the Washington Post said:

For 20 years the committee has been disclosing and reporting on the pattern of Communist infiltration of American life; this part of its function has long since been completed, and the pattern of the past no longer has much application to the present.

In view of the record, how silly can we get?

I could take an hour on the floor of the House today and tell you of incident after incident of revelations made by the Committee on Un-American Activities, not of past Communist activities but of infiltration and subversion that is taking place at this very moment.

I will give you just one example which is as current as this morning's newspapers. We have been worried about a sputnik in outer space. Well, gentlemen, the House Committee on Un-American Activities uncovered a sputnik right here in the House of Representatives—not 5 years ago, not 2 years ago, not 1 year ago, but just 2 months ago.

The Communist record of one Wilfred Lumer was just recently brought to light. Now, who was Wilfred Lumer? He was a man who was doing research for Members of this House—for two committees of this Congress. His handiwork found its way into reports on legislation that is being considered by this Congress.

Let me read just three questions and answers from his testimony taken just 71 days ago, which will illustrate my point.

Mr. ARENS. During the course of this assistance which you have rendered on the Hill to the Congress, have you at any time in the course of the rendition of that assistance been under the discipline of the Communist Party?

Mr. LUMER (after conferring with his counsel). I again decline to answer on the grounds of the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. ARENS. Have you reported your activities on the Hill, on Capitol Hill, over the course of the last several years to a person known by you to be a Communist?

Mr. LUMER. I must decline to answer that question on the grounds of the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. ARENS. We have information, and I want to be absolutely frank with you, Mr. Lumer—we have information that in the recent past you have been in contact, and under discipline, of Sam Abbott, a ranking Communist in the District of Columbia. We want to give you an opportunity now while under oath to deny it.

Mr. LUMER. I must decline to answer that on the grounds of the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I am offering my opposition to this legislation not because I oppose the idea, but because I oppose the committee's practices. The committee has done a laudable job in quarantining Communists, although I think that in many instances its publicity has been unwise and regrettable in that it has ruined innocent men and women.

However, I am offering my opposition to highlight the fact that this Committee on Un-American Activities has refused consistently through the years, regardless who the chairman was and is, to investigate the activities of the Ku Klux Klan. American citizens are being beaten, houses of God—especially in Montgomery, Ala.—have been bombed, the rule of terror and violence is superseding that of law and yet the Ku Klux Klan goes on its nefarious un-American way, seemingly with the approval by indifference of the House Un-American Activities Committee. I have written

through the years innumerable letters to the various chairmen asking for comment on this and have never received the courtesy of a reply. The Catholic magazine *Commonweal* just published an editorial calling on the committee to investigate the Klan activities in Mobile, Ala., and offered to give the committee the names and addresses of Klan leaders which they have in their possession, and no reply was made to them, nor to my letter in which I forwarded this editorial from this outstanding Roman Catholic publication.

The only positive action taken against the Ku Klux Klan was taken the other day in North Carolina by the only real Americans and it is unfortunate all of us in the House who are immigrants, for the only real Americans are the American Indians, sit by year after year and let the Ku Klux Klan supersede law and order.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, certainly I approve the continued operations of the Un-American Activities Committee. In no way do I believe that the committee has outlived its usefulness. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the need to preserve America's system and strength and to hold under constant surveillance the inauguration and development of un-American activity is of prime importance, so that this Congress may meet new and renewed threats by appropriate and timely legislation.

We cannot hide from the fact that other countries of the world have fallen victim to subversive activities inspired and directed from without. Nor can we hide from the fact that such activities are carried out in our own country. It is true that as soon as we are informed upon current methods and volume of such activities we can proceed legislatively to counteract them. But we cannot be so naive as to believe that a power intent upon our destruction will continue to employ the same methods once they have been discovered and publicized. We would not give credit to the intelligence or sinister mission of our adversaries were we to believe that new subversive methods will not be inaugurated by them, methods which will certainly be concealed until our committee can discover them and advise the Congress. We must continue the work of this Un-American Activities Committee and give it our enthusiastic endorsement.

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the permission to speak on a subject I consider of supreme importance to the security of America. I refer to the continuation of the House Un-American Activities Committee. This committee began as a special committee in 1938 and became permanent in 1945. This fact reflects the need for continued surveillance of those organizations or individuals who would have subverted us. In my opinion, these anti-Americans and Communists have continued their efforts. The fact that the House Un-American Activities Committee has been diligent in performing its functions is a contributing factor to our awareness of the dangers of subversion from within.

My section of the country, Chicago, is the heartland of America. Citizens

are disturbed over any possibility that this committee's vital work would be disbanded because of pressure from 50,000 anti-anti-Communists.

Yesterday I issued a statement for the press in which I clearly stated my belief that this committee must go on. I stated "nothing would please Russia more than to see the public demand this committee to cease. This would be another gain for them and an inestimable loss to America."

I believe it would behoove all Americans to read the committee's excellent report entitled "Operation Abolition." I am sure thousands of Chicagoans stand ready to come to the defense of this committee if necessary. They are waiting for the word from Congress as a result of any action we might take.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee again in this my sixth term in this distinguished legislative body, and in view of the brief statement of opposition to the pending resolution by my distinguished colleague from Illinois to the effect that in his judgment the said committee had outlived its usefulness and importance, I should like to say:

First, that as an understanding and sympathetic friend of the working people of our beloved Nation, both in organized labor and outside, the gentleman from Illinois would be surprised to know how very frequently our committee is asked by leaders of organized labor throughout our Nation, to assist them in their handling the problem of subversive activities of Communists and their bedfellows and followers within given local unions. In other words, quite often vigilant, patriotic union leaders ask our help to protect and preserve the democratic processes within their respective local unions against the deceitful, cheating, and unpatriotic subversive activities of subversive elements within their unions which design to either gain control or keep control of those local union boards and offices for the avowed purpose of initiating or continuing the Communist and subversive philosophy within the control of those unions. One of the most hopeful signs I see is the increasing extent to which vigilant, patriotic organized labor leaders are thus taking vigorous and positive steps to obtain necessary help to protect the democratic processes of their organized labor groups.

Secondly, I wish to say that I trust the House will realize that this committee only has nine Members of the House upon it; that you will further realize, that each member of the committee is also a member of at least one other major committee of the House and that the nature of the work of our Un-American Activities Committee being what it is, with the frequency of meetings and hearings necessary, it is a very considerable problem to meet the needs of this necessary committee and of our other major committees also. Frequently it arises that meeting hours and dates are exactly the same time. Then too, from the nature of our committee hearings and reports as governed by our committee rules, we find it necessary to

put in very many hours reading the text of voluminous hearings and reports before they are released or published. This applies to all nine members of the committee.

Thirdly, may I say that I can tell from the understanding remarks made to me by Members of this House, that the Members generally understood and appreciate that the work of the members of this committee is not only definitely challenging, but it is an unusual responsibility that is upon our shoulders. This is because many of the considerable number of witnesses who appear before our committee are not only termed "unfriendly witnesses," they are determined that the committee shall not obtain one iota of information from them in order to help Congress better and more adequately meet the problem, of not only the Communist subversive activities of individuals or groups of individuals or of their subversive programs, but they vehemently deny that Congress has any legal, or even moral right, to ask or expect them to cooperate with Congress in the field of protecting our constitutional representative form of government from subversive destruction.

However, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, it is refreshing and invigorating and encouraging, to note the number of American citizens who have not too far back been active in the Communist Party, or very close to its activities, who voluntarily cooperate with us in our fulfillment of our duties under Public Law 601.

May I repeat again that statement which no doubt some of you have heard me make, with reference to my attitude toward the rights of my fellow citizens in connection with my functioning as a member of the committee? Briefly I repeat it as follows: to wit, that I will fight for the right of my fellow Americans to say what they wish, write what they wish, to pray the way they wish, and to think the way they wish. But, Mr. Speaker, these must stay within the four corners of the Constitution of the United States. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, theirs must be lawful activities. They must be within the established law of our beloved Nation. Ours is a Nation of laws. It must always be such if it is to continue a constitutional representative form of government. I am consciously thankful to the Creator of all mankind that we Americans have the freedoms guaranteed us by our Constitution, including our Bill of Rights. But, these freedoms which I cherish do not authorize me to condemn my fellowman's thinking merely or primarily because it differs from mine if my neighbor is legally and patriotically within his constitutional rights. It is within this area of thinking and action by me that I find comfort in vigilantly protecting these very rights against the deceitful, illegal and subversive activities of any person with such evil and destructive activities.

Several members have recently asked me about the committee's relative importance now, as against 2 or 3 years ago. I have said to them and I say in session assembled that, in my considered judgment, it is not less necessary now for Congress to maintain this committee

than in any year heretofore. Personally, I would hope there may be further and extended opportunities for the committee to have opportunity to do even more in the field of subversive activities. But, we have made definite progress and improvements. I know the mental attitude of each of the members of the committee so well I am sure it is unanimous we will continue to be diligent in the improvement of our committee processes.

And lastly, Mr. Speaker, being from the great 23d District of Los Angeles County, Calif., I am fully aware that within the last several months, especially in southern California, there has emanated therefrom a definite program and undertaking thereabouts, by the Commies, wherever they are, and by their sympathizers or unknowing supporters, to abolish this committee. They have designated it "Campaign for Abolition." They went to the recent convention of some of the Democratic clubs at Fresno. Prior to that convention and in connection therewith they sought activities of the convention resolutions committee and personnel to speak out for the abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee. In this very active effort they miserably failed.

I mention this because, being a Democrat by registration, I do not want this legislative body to be misinformed on this point from California or anyplace else. That convention at Fresno a few weeks ago did not resolve that the House Un-American Activities Committee should be abolished. It did criticize the terms of our Public Law 601, referring to the Watkins case decision by the Supreme Court. And it did resolve that that Supreme Court decision should be followed. But this is a far cry from their deliberate misinformation and false propaganda, widely circulated throughout the State of California and otherwise, about the activities of the committee. I also know that all, or practically all, of the Members of this House on this morning received written communications asking them to vote to deny our committee funds and to vote against this pending resolution.

I wish to repeat that I believe the vigorous, vigilant, adequately financed functioning of our committee is essential; and the way the world is, it appears crystal clear to me, that it will continue to be at least equally essential for a long, long time. I wish it were not so. It makes me feel very uncomfortable to be aware of the number of people and small groups, which continue designedly and subversively in their despicable program and effort to undertake the change of our constitutional government, by subversive means, rather than by the means contained in our Constitution itself. I recommend the approval of this resolution and the amount of money therein contained.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, and because within the last few days three or four Members of the House have asked me to call their attention to the text of Public Law 601, I herewith include it, closing my extemporaneous remarks:

PUBLIC LAW 601, 79TH CONGRESS

The legislation under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities oper-

ates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress (1946), chapter 753, 2d session, which provides:

"Be it enacted, etc.—

"PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

"Rule X

"SEC. 121. Standing committees:

"17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

"Rule XI

"Powers and Duties of Committees

"(q) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.

"(A) Un-American Activities.

"(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

"The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

"For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member."

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure and satisfaction that I heartily approve and support the request of the House Committee on Un-American Activities for funds for the current year.

As a member of the committee for several years, and its ranking Republican member, I know that the Members of the House and the vast majority of Americans have indicated their desire for a continuation of this committee, under the brilliant leadership of our distinguished chairman, the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, and their approval of its request for the necessary funds.

Most of the members of the committee have from time to time received letters and telegrams from deluded individuals and organizations demanding that the House Committee on Un-American Activities be abolished stating in substance "that the committee has outlived its usefulness." How naive can these individuals and organizations be? To me, more than ever, the necessity is apparent for the continuation of this committee looking into the question of Communist infiltration and subversion that is taking

place day in and day out, not only in the past but at this very moment.

I want to call the attention of my colleagues to the committee formed last year known as the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee which had for its objective a campaign to cripple the anti-subversive programs of the Congress, to shackle or abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and to destroy a great American and his agency, namely J. Edgar Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This campaign was launched throughout the United States and meetings were held in numerous cities throughout the country, particularly during the month of October 1957.

It might be well to advise the Members of the House that practically without exception every member of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee has a record as a member of the Communist Party or Communist front organizations as long as one's arm. Quoting from the pamphlet released by our House Committee on Un-American Activities entitled "Operation Abolition":

The Emergency Civil Liberties Committee's campaign was inaugurated at a rally in New York City in Carnegie Hall on September 20, 1957. The speakers included Harvey O'Connor; Louis L. Redding, an attorney; Dalton Trumbo, one of the notorious Hollywood 10; Prof. Hugh H. Wilson, of Princeton University; and Frank Wilkinson, of Los Angeles.

Dalton Trumbo is the individual who has been identified in sworn public testimony as a member of the Communist Party and who was convicted of contempt of Congress for his refusal to answer questions when appearing as a witness before the committee and who vilified the committee at this meeting along with J. Edgar Hoover, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and derided a group of Hungarian patriots who were picketing the rally.

The objectives of this Emergency Civil Liberties Committee are the destruction of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the extinction of the investigative powers of the Congress in the field of subversive activities, the restriction of important functions of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the investigation of subversive activities, and the creation of a general climate of opinion against the exposure and punishment of subversion.

One member of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee—namely, Hugh Hardyman—when questioned by a subcommittee on the Committee on Un-American Activities during the year 1955 concerning a speaking campaign which he had conducted in Iron Curtain countries and in the United States under the sponsorship of the Southern California Peace Crusade, had brought to his attention a speech he made while in China which was recorded for rebroadcast to other parts of the world in which he lied and accused the United States of perpetrating a crime against mankind by waging germ warfare in Korea. In this speech, referring to biological warfare, Hardyman said, and I quote:

Our Government has used this revolting method of warfare on a wide scale, but the blame for this crime against mankind was

never once placed on us, the American people.

While a witness before our committee, Hardyman invoked the fifth amendment consistently when asked questions regarding his association with identified Communists and Communist causes.

I could go on listing name after name of this committee and others.

Shortly before the vote on the resolution requesting funds for the operation of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I was informed of a telegram sent from California opposing the request and signed, "The Committee To Protect American Freedom." To the misguided individuals comprising this committee, if such a committee actually exists, may I suggest in all sincerity that the House Committee on Un-American Activities is the real committee to protect American freedom.

There is only one objective of the Communist and that is world domination and any method employed to accomplish this objective is used whether it be by lying propaganda, half truths, or false pronouncements. Let us not be deceived. Let it be brought to the attention of all Communists and fellow travelers that the House of Representatives by its vote approving the resolution creating funds for the Committee on Un-American Activities is saying, in effect, to all concerned, "We will do everything within our power to protect our American way of life and do everything to bring to light any and all individuals or organizations who have other ideas alien to our American form of government."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who wish to do so may be permitted to extend their remarks just prior to the vote on House Resolution 426 just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

LABOR UNIONS AND THEIR MEMBERS

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, members of labor unions and workers generally have lost many of their rights hitherto guaranteed them under the Constitution. To a great degree this has been due to the tremendous power given by law to labor-union leaders without requiring them to assume commensurate responsibility. Power and responsibility must go hand in hand if freedom is to be preserved.

There are many well-managed, excellent labor unions and there are

thousands of honest, conscientious labor-union leaders.

But, Mr. Speaker, when power is unlimited and union leaders are, in effect, above the law, abuses creep in and we have seen thousands of cruel and unfair practices denying the worker—the member for whom the union is organized—his rights.

I have introduced a bill (H. R. 10351) which might be termed the workers bill of rights. This bill, if adopted, should, in effect, return the control of the unions to the man-at-the-bench, or to the worker, wherever he may be. It is a bill in his behalf. It provides for real and honest election of officers, for the possible recall of officers, for the initiative and referendum on internal affairs, for secret ballots on strike decisions, for proper procedures, for the control of trusteeships over local union affairs, for the prevention of monopolistic allocations of territory, for proper registration and auditing of employee-welfare plans, for the prevention of many resultant abuses, and generally for the protection of members.

Mr. Speaker, if the substance of this amendment to the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 is adopted, and my bill, H. R. 678, removing the exemption of labor unions from the antimonopoly laws, most of the present scandalous and, to some degree, tragic abuses will, in my judgment, largely disappear and workers will soon be regaining their rights.

GET THE GOVERNMENT OUT OF THE FARMING BUSINESS

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, if the Members of this Congress are wondering how they can best help farmers they might listen to the farmers themselves.

As a matter of fact, a substantial number of farmers have already voted their preference and a whopping 73 percent went on record as opposing additional Government help. Included in that group were 50.1 percent who wanted the Government to "get clear out of farming," 11 percent who wanted less Government help than now, and 12 percent who preferred help "about the same as now."

This expression of farm sentiment against increased Government farm-aid programs was announced in the February 1958 issue of the Farm Journal which is just off the press. In December, the Farm Journal, one of the largest farm magazines in the Nation, sent ballots to each of its 3.4 million subscribers asking them to "help decide which direction our farm program should go now." The nationwide results quoted above came from tabulations of the first 4,000 returns received.

We have heard the voice of the farmer. It came in loud and clear. His over-

whelming vote against increased Government farm programs indicates that the new food and fiber program presented by the administration this year is the sort of a program he wants. We have about all the guidance we need if we really want to help farmers.

The record will show whether this Congress listened to their pleas for more freedom or whether—in the name of helping them—we saddled them with still more controls and restrictions.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. ASHMORE], I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration may sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR AND CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Private Calendar on Tuesday and the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week may both be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

FORMULA FOR TAXING INCOME OF LIFE-INSURANCE COMPANIES

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 456 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10021) to provide that the 1955 formula for taxing income of life insurance companies shall also apply to taxable years beginning in 1957. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 456 makes in order the consideration of H. R. 10021, a bill dealing with the taxation of life-insurance companies. The resolution provides for an open rule and 2 hours of general debate.

The bill is, in effect, a stopgap measure which will extend to the year 1957 the formula for computing the taxes life-insurance companies will pay which was adopted in 1955, and extended in 1956. The Revenue Code contains a basic formula which was adopted in 1942. If the formula used in 1955 and 1956 is not extended to 1957, life-insurance companies would be required to pay their 1957 taxes under the 1942 formula.

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee stated in his testimony before the Rules Committee that it is believed that the 1942 formula is fundamentally unsound, and, in addition, certain improvements made in the 1955 formula would be lost if not extended for another year.

The Treasury Department has indicated that specific proposals to provide a permanent method of taxing life-insurance companies would be advanced shortly, at which time the Committee on Ways and Means will make a further study of the entire subject. In the meantime, the Committee on Ways and Means has determined that the 1955 formula should be extended to 1957 and unanimously reported H. R. 10021.

I urge the adoption of House Resolution 456 so the House may proceed to the consideration of H. R. 10021 for which ample time for debate has been provided.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to the rule and now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the Committee on Ways and Means reported this bill out unanimously to the Committee on Rules. All it is is an extension of the act now in existence.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10021) to provide that the 1955 formula for taxing income of life-insurance companies shall also apply to taxable years beginning in 1957.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 10021, with Mr. ABERNETHY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the pending bill, H. R. 10021, deals with the taxation of life-insurance companies. The word "insurance" suggests the numerous tax problems of the beneficiary of life-insurance policies, but the present bill deals only with the taxation imposed upon the companies themselves on the income that they earn. As you know, the life-insurance industry is unique in that two-thirds of the business done is by mutual companies. There are a large number of

stock companies in the industry but on the average these are smaller than the mutuals. The Congress has always determined tax policy in this area with an awareness of the competitive position of these smaller stock companies.

Since 1919 life-insurance companies have been subject to income tax on one or another formula that imposed tax on a portion of their investment income only. The particular investment formula imposed by the Revenue Act of 1942 has been in the tax law ever since then, although it has not been operative since 1948. Since 1948 various, so-called, stopgap formulas have been imposed on each occasion for only 1 year at a time. In each case, these stopgap formulas were simply added to the code without removing the 1942 formula. The present bill would extend the stopgap formula applied in 1955 and 1956 to apply to the income of life-insurance companies for 1957. This will be the tax on last year's income for which the companies must file returns by March 15 of this year. It is clear why speedy action on the bill is desirable.

If the 1942 formula should come back into operation for calendar year 1957, the life-insurance companies would pay taxes of about \$415 million on their 1957 income. Under the 1955-56 formula, which the committee proposes to extend to 1957, the companies would pay about \$291 million. One circumstance that strongly influenced the committee in its action on this bill was the reason why the 1942 formula was abandoned in 1949. That formula was actually constructed in such a way that a fall in interest rates would cut the tax on life-insurance companies sharply without respect to the amount of their earnings. Under the 1942 formula, the companies had virtually no tax to pay in 1947 and in 1948. But now interest rates are higher. We believe that this formula is fundamentally unsound; and since the Congress was not satisfied to use it when it produced too little revenue, it seems unreasonable to use it when it produces a great deal more revenue. Furthermore, the life-insurance industry had reason to assume in its financial decisions during 1957 that the rate in effect for 1955-56 would be continued. Your committee believed that if the Congress should now indicate its intention to permit the old 1942 formula to come into operation for 1957, this would, in practical effect, be very much like a retroactive increase in taxes.

Another reason for wanting to continue the 1955-56 formula is that this method of taxation of life-insurance companies contains several basic improvements in technique which would be lost if the formula reverted to the 1942 provisions. The 1955-56 method of taxing life-insurance companies provides, in effect, a lower rate of tax applicable to the first million dollars of investment income and thereby provides a very significant benefit to small life-insurance companies. In addition, the 1955-56 formula provides a more realistic method of allocating income to the accident and health business conducted by the life-insurance companies.

There remains to be explained why we have this matter of continuous stopgap legislation in the life insurance field. The Committee on Ways and Means advanced in 1955 a proposal for a permanent formula for taxing life-insurance companies. At that time the Secretary of the Treasury endorsed the formula only as a 1-year stopgap with the understanding that the Department of the Treasury would shortly submit recommendations for permanent legislation on the basis of the total income of life-insurance companies rather than on an investment-income formula. Following the Treasury's recommendations, the Ways and Means Committee's proposals contained in H. R. 7201 were applied only for 1955. In 1956 since the Treasury had still not developed an alternative plan, the formula of H. R. 7201 was extended to the incomes earned in 1956.

The Treasury has not yet fully developed its proposals for a permanent method of taxing life-insurance companies, hence the need to extend the formula for 1957. The Treasury has informed the committee, however, that their recommendations will be forthcoming in the very near future. It may be observed that this area is particularly complicated, even compared to the complicated problems that we usually encounter in taxation. It is interesting that the financial problems of life insurance are so complicated that they had to invent a new branch of mathematics, actuarial science, to deal with these problems. It is worthwhile to spend a great deal of time working out these problems before legislation is enacted rather than finding the mistakes after the legislation.

The Treasury Department has joined the committee in recommending extension of the stopgap formula of H. R. 10021 to the year 1957 in preference to letting the 1942 formula apply.

We have hopes that a permanent solution will be found this year to apply to 1958 and subsequent years.

Mr. Chairman, at this point, I would like to make comparison of the 1942 and 1955-56 formulas.

Since 1942 there have been three stopgap laws for taxing the income of life-insurance companies: The 1950 formula, applicable to 1949 and 1950; the 1951 formula, applicable to 1951-54; and H. R. 7201, originally applicable to 1955 but extended to apply to 1956. Since these laws were all intended to apply for a limited time, the provisions of the 1942 act relating to life-insurance companies have been retained as the law which would apply at the expiration of each of the stopgap periods. When H. R. 7201 was enacted in the early part of 1956, it provided a new method for a temporary period for taxing life-insurance companies. This new method has been applied to the years 1955-56. This bill extends this new method to the year 1957.

The principal difference between the 1942 formula and H. R. 7201 is in the "reserve and other policy liability deduction." Under H. R. 7201, this deduction is 85 percent—87½ percent for the first \$1 million—of the net investment income—investment income less invest-

ment expenses. Under the 1942 formula, this deduction is a varying percentage promulgated each year on the basis of the experience of all companies for the preceding year and known as the secretary's ratio. This is a ratio determined on a weighted average basis, in essence by taking 65 percent of 3¼ percent of the average reserves of all companies for the preceding year and 35 percent of the actual average rate of interest used by all companies applied to their reserves, and comparing this result with the total net investment income of all companies. Such a secretary's ratio for 1957—on the basis of 1956 data—would be much less than the 85 to 87½ percent deduction under H. R. 7201.

H. R. 7201 has a provision primarily benefiting smaller companies, whereas the 1942 formula does not have such a provision. Under the 1942 formula, each company would deduct as its "reserve and other policy liability deduction" the same percentage of its net investment income. Under H. R. 7201 the deduction is 87½ percent of the first \$1 million of net investment income and 85 percent of the balance. Thus, a company with a net investment income of less than or only slightly more than \$1 million is taxed, in effect, at a lower rate than its larger competitor.

In addition, the formula provides a method of taxing income allocable to accident- and health-insurance business of life-insurance companies which is based upon the actual earnings on the reserves of such business instead of hypothetical earnings, as provided by the 1942 formula.

It is roughly estimated that the taxes for 1957 which would be produced by the Mills plan are about \$291 million. The 1942 plan—as revised in present law—would yield about \$415 million.

The principle is the same in both plans. In both cases net investment income, with a deduction for amounts needed to meet policy obligations, forms the tax base, underwriting gains and losses being ignored.

All of the loophole-closing provisions of the Mills-Curtis plan were made a part of permanent law by the 1955-56 formula.

They are as follows:

(a) Since 85 percent of dividend income is deducted, it does not seem realistic to allow the dividends received credit. In H. R. 7201, this credit is eliminated. This provision is now a permanent part of existing law.

(b) The definition of investment income was expanded to include not only interest, dividends, and rents, but also royalties, income from the negotiation or termination of leases, mortgages, etc., and any income from the operation of a business (such as a farm acquired after foreclosure of a mortgage). Appropriate deductions for depletion on royalties, operating expenses of a business acquired, etc., were provided. This provision is now a permanent part of existing law.

(c) To prevent what is really an investment holding company (where the assets are far in excess of those that would be needed for insurance obligations) from being taxed as a life-insurance company, it is provided that the reserve and other policy liability deduction shall in no case be more than twice the amount of the actual interest required to be added to reserves in accordance with the company's books. This restriction was alleviated with respect to new com-

panies (sec. 818). Both provisions apply to H. R. 7201. This provision is now a permanent part of existing law.

Mr. MILLS. I do want to point out what we might expect in the way of revenue if we were to tax the incomes of life-insurance companies under these various formulas. If we were to let the 1942 formula apply, it would produce \$415 million at current levels. If we should reenact the expired stopgap formula, it would produce \$536 million, and if we should revive the 1951 formula which existed for the taxable years 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954, it would produce \$244 million. The provisions of this bill will produce \$291 million. We do not pretend to advise the committee that \$291 million is the proper amount for life-insurance companies to pay at this time or that any of these other formulas, if we did apply them to 1957, would bring to us from the life-insurance industry the requisite or proper amount of revenue. That is a matter which we think the committee should have an opportunity of looking further into with respect to the years after 1957.

I would not want to permit taxes to rise with respect to any of our taxpayers without having full discussion, full hearings, and full consideration of the matter.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to inquire of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means if in compiling the estimates of receipts the Treasury Department used \$500 million, plus, \$244 million or \$294 million in estimating the receipts.

Mr. MILLS. It is my understanding, and I may be wrong, but it is my recollection that the budget itself is predicated upon the application of the 1955-56 law.

Mr. BAILEY. And the legislation would materially reduce the receipts?

Mr. MILLS. As I have stated, receipts will be lower under the bill than the 1942 formula.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. WIER. As I understand your presentation, there is no difference between mutual and stock companies in this bill.

Mr. MILLS. They are treated alike under the bill. As the gentleman knows, taxwise we have never made any distinction between mutual and stock life insurance companies. We have made distinctions with reference to mutual and stock casualty companies but not life insurance companies.

I urge the adoption of this proposal.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation before this distinguished Committee today, H. R. 10021, would extend with respect to taxable years beginning in 1957 the same tax formula that was applicable to the income of life-insurance companies

for taxable years beginning in 1955 and in 1956. The Committee on Ways and Means was unanimous in favorably reporting this legislation.

It is important that the Congress act expeditiously in the consideration of this legislation because of the requirement that the taxpayers affected will have to comply with a return date of March 15, 1958, with respect to 1957 taxable income. Failure to act on this legislation would make effective the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code embodying the 1942 formula for taxing income of life-insurance companies. As indicated in the committee report accompanying this legislation, the restoration of the 1942 formula into effectiveness would be unreasonable and would constitute a return to a fundamentally unsound tax formula. In my judgment it would be unfair to permit the once discarded 1942 formula to return to effect without public hearings and without detailed study in executive session after being in disuse for 8 years. One important consideration that the membership of this Committee should bear in mind is that the formula applicable in 1955 and 1956 treats small insurance companies in a more favorable manner than would be true under the 1942 formula.

The Secretary of the Treasury in an appearance before the Committee on Ways and Means indicated his intention to submit to the Congress in the near future Treasury Department recommendations for the establishment of a permanent method of taxation for life insurance company income. A 1-year extension of the 1955-56 formula will permit sufficient time for the receipt of this Treasury recommendation and its thorough study by the Congress with a view to developing a permanent formula. The Treasury Department has approved the extension of the formula to taxable years beginning in 1957.

If H. R. 10021 is enacted into law, the legislation is expected to produce approximately \$290 million in revenue with respect to taxable year 1957. This amounts to a \$29 million increase over tax revenues realized in 1956. I am informed that this increase in tax revenues received from life insurance companies is proportionate to the normal growth of assets and the increase in investment return experienced by the industry.

Mr. Chairman, for these reasons and for the reason that time between now and March 15 does not permit the development of an alternative method of taxation of life insurance company income, I support the enactment of H. R. 10021 and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of its passage.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, on the opening day of the current session of the Congress, January 7, 1958, I introduced a bill known as H. R. 9728 which is identical to the pending bill H. R. 10021. This proposed legislation is urgently needed and will be of benefit to more

than 100 million insurance policyholders. I urge that this bill be approved without a dissenting vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleagues who have preceded me in this debate to express support of the favorable consideration of H. R. 10021 relating to the tax formula applicable to income of life-insurance companies. This legislation would continue the temporary formula that applied in 1955 and 1956 to 1957.

For the past several years the Congress and the Department of the Treasury have worked sometimes with diligence and sometimes with what I will refer to as a little less diligence in an attempt to develop a permanent formula. Because of outstanding work done by my distinguished colleague from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], who was chairman of a subcommittee on life-insurance taxation during the 83d Congress, the membership of the House had reason to believe that the legislation we passed in 1955 would constitute a permanent formula. The permanency was short lived, for when the legislation reached the other body for consideration the Treasury Department and membership of that other body decided that the fruits of our arduous labors should be honored by only a temporary life. Accordingly, this legislation has been in effect as I previously indicated for taxable years beginning in 1955 and 1956.

If this legislation now under consideration is not enacted into public law within the period of the next 6 weeks, the applicable tax formula that would come into effect is what is referred to as the 1942 formula. As my esteemed friend and colleague from New York [Mr. REED] has explained to the membership, it would be grossly unfair to permit the discarded 1942 formula to come into effect because of the greater tax impact it would have on small insurance companies and because its long period of disuse would, in good conscience, require extensive hearings and careful consideration in executive session.

I am confident that the months ahead will find an emphasis on diligence on the part of the Congress and on the part of the Treasury Department and on the part of the great life insurance industry working together to develop a fair and equitable tax formula that may be made applicable to income of life insurance companies on a permanent basis. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this necessary and, under the circumstances, meritorious extension of the 1955-56 tax formula for 1 more year.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. IKARD].

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Chairman, there is very little I can add to the very fine explanation of this legislation that was given by our fine chairman and the distinguished gentleman from New York, [Mr. REED]. I would, however, point

out that we have continually been passing stopgap legislation for life-insurance companies. In my judgment it is not fair either to the Government or to the taxpayers involved to continually force them, in effect, to compute their tax after the taxable year has passed. There is real need, almost an emergency, for some permanent legislation providing for taxation of life-insurance companies.

When this legislation we are now considering was originally before the Congress and during its consideration we were assured that recommendations would be forthcoming for some permanent program. Since that time we have continually been on the brink, so to speak, of getting at the problem, but the Treasury has never completed its plan.

The present Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Anderson, has indicated a real interest in this problem, and other officials in the Department have said that in the very near future they will have recommendations for a permanent program. I would like here to state that I hope those recommendations are forthcoming at the earliest possible date so that the Committee on Ways and Means in considering this problem, which as our chairman said is a very technical one, will, before this time next year, produce some permanent legislation that will be fair to the Government and to the taxpayers and under which they will know what their taxes were going to be before the taxable year was ended.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, this is the second bill that the Committee on Ways and Means has brought in for consideration during the past week. Both of the bills are worthy ones. Yet I cannot escape the conclusion that it is about time we also bring in a bill that I think the country would welcome. That is, a bill that would permit deduction from income tax by members of faculties, of secondary institutions, and of schools for expenses incurred in bettering their education and in developing their knowledge. I know there are a number of these bills pending before the Committee on Ways and Means and I hope the time is not too far distant when a bill of this type will be brought in.

I am a member of the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations. We have just concluded hearings for the National Science Foundation, which agency is asking for an appropriation of hundreds of thousands of dollars to permit scholarships and fellowships to go to science teachers throughout the country, not only in high schools, but in colleges as well. Unfortunately, the money that the National Science Foundation has available for that purpose will affect only a relatively small number of teachers.

One of the big criticisms that has been advanced against our educational program is the fact that too many of our teachers are too poorly trained to provide the education that is necessary for

the children of our country. In my opinion, the Committee on Ways and Means should hold hearings very quickly on a subject as important as this in order that teachers throughout the country, who want to better themselves and who want to provide a better type of education for the children of our Nation, may be able to make appropriate deductions for that purpose.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. I merely want to observe for the benefit of the gentleman from Illinois that the Committee on Ways and Means has held a hearing on the question of the deduction of expenses incurred by teachers in bettering themselves. That occurred some days ago. Representatives of the teaching profession came to the committee and made a very strong statement in support of the gentleman's position.

Mr. YATES. Will the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means advise the gentleman from Illinois as to whether the committee intends to bring in an appropriate bill soon?

Mr. MILLS. It is impossible for me as chairman of that committee to tell the gentleman what the committee will finally decide to do, because we have not been in executive session on matters of that kind. We have had hearings and those hearings will continue until the 7th of February.

Mr. YATES. At that time will the committee give consideration to a bill and to the testimony that has been presented?

Mr. MILLS. The committee will not then give consideration to the testimony that has been given to us immediately at the close of the hearing, but will do so at a later date, the reason being that we want our staff people to have an opportunity to thoroughly analyze all of the suggestions that have come to the committee and to bring back to us some solution to the many problems presented to us. In the meantime, the committee has already announced it will begin hearings on reciprocal-trade agreements on February 17.

Mr. YATES. Does the chairman imply from his latter statement that there will be no consideration given to this bill for some time?

Mr. MILLS. No, certainly not. I say that during the course of the next few weeks the committee will be in executive session on this entire subject matter covering tax revisions.

Mr. YATES. The chairman is speaking all around the point that I have addressed myself to.

Mr. MILLS. Only because the chairman is never in a position to tell a Member of the House what the committee will do without consulting the members of the Committee on Ways and Means, whose servant he is.

Mr. YATES. That is true, but I think the gentleman with his long experience in the House knows that the chairmen of committees have some persuasive powers.

Mr. MILLS. Oh, if the gentleman is trying to lead me into a discussion of

the merits of the proposal, I cannot indulge in that at this time.

Mr. YATES. I am not. I am only trying to get the chairman to indicate he will use his persuasive powers with the other members of the committee.

Mr. MILLS. I would like to advise the gentleman more fully and I appreciate his remarks as to my persuasiveness.

Mr. YATES. I have no allusions as to the gentleman's powers. I know he is one of the most persuasive Members of the House. I am sure that with respect to the members of his committee his persuasive powers are even greater. But I would like to obtain some kind of statement from the chairman as to whether or not a bill of the type under discussion will be considered within the near future.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes. I admit to the gentleman readily that this suggestion and all other suggestions made in the course of the hearings will in the next few weeks be considered in executive session of the committee, but I cannot tell the gentleman how soon we can end the executive sessions.

Mr. YATES. I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, I find that statement somewhat unsatisfactory. Perhaps I am being unfair in this.

Mr. MILLS. Would the gentleman yield to me further?

I find that most Members are dissatisfied when any statement is made with respect to any delay that may be incident to the preparation of any proposal that has some merit and is in the direction of a reduction in taxes. Certainly we are all enthusiastic in giving consideration as soon as we can to such proposals.

Mr. YATES. Let me say to the gentleman as a taxpayer and one who would not be affected by this bill, except with respect to the possibility of paying additional taxes because of the deductions which are sought to be made under this bill, I would welcome the payment of additional taxes for this purpose. I happen to believe that the social purpose of the legislation about which I am talking is so great at this particular time that it deserves special consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means, apart from the other suggestions made to the committee. The chairman of the committee, I am sure, is aware of the tremendous pressure in this country for an increase in the higher standards of our educational system, particularly in the fields of science and mathematics. I believe all teachers should obtain these benefits, because I feel it is essential to a better education. That is why I think a bill of this kind warrants special consideration.

Mr. MILLS. I appreciate the gentleman's thought and, of course, the committee will give consideration to his thinking on the matter and expedite the consideration of this matter as rapidly as possible.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I rise just to ask the chairman of the committee if he would be willing at this time to tell us whether the Committee on Ways and Means is considering or has had any testimony toward giving those parents who have children going to college an additional tax exemption.

Mr. MILLS. The Committee on Ways and Means has also heard testimony on that point in the course of the current hearings. I do not want to attempt to say what the Committee on Ways and Means will do. As chairman of the committee, my idea is that I am the servant of the committee, and I would never try to hold out that I could in any way influence the membership of the Committee on Ways and Means. They are very fine, capable gentlemen, and I am sure that the membership of the Committee of the Whole feels, as the gentleman does, that the Committee on Ways and Means should give consideration to the many subject matters that have been presented to the committee in the course of these hearings, and this is one of the subject matters on which we have had testimony.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I particularly asked, because it seems to me in the presentation of the President's program as well as the program submitted today by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT], that the great decision on the part of the Committee on Education and Labor will depend largely on what the Committee on Ways and Means is willing to do on their side of the program. It seems to me there should be some coordination between the two committees in that overall educational program. It is awfully hard for one to act independently of the other.

Mr. MILLS. I understand the gentleman's point.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, if I am not out of order, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD] on this his birthday.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

SEC. 1. Extension of 1955 formula to 1957.

Subsections (a) and (c) of section 802 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to tax on income of life-insurance companies) are each amended by striking out "beginning in 1955 or in 1956" and inserting in lieu thereof "beginning after December 31, 1954, and before January 1, 1958."

SEC. 2. Technical amendments.

(a) The heading of section 802 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 802. Tax imposed."

(b) The table of sections for subpart A of part I of subchapter L of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out

"Sec. 802. Tax imposed for 1955 and 1956." and inserting in lieu thereof

"Sec. 802. Tax imposed."

(c) Section 811 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to tax under 1942 formula) is amended by striking out

"December 31, 1956" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1957."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. McCORMACK] having assumed the chair, Mr. ABERNETHY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10021) to provide that the 1955 formula for taxing income of life insurance companies shall also apply to taxable years beginning in 1957, pursuant to House Resolution 456, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL MONUMENT SYMBOLIZING IDEALS OF DEMOCRACY

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 459, Rept. No. 1313), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8290) to authorize the erection of a national monument symbolizing the ideals of democracy in the fulfillment of the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1029), "An act to create a National Monument Commission, and for other purposes." After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

IMPORT DUTIES ON CERTAIN COARSE WOOL

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 460, Rept. No. 1314), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2151) to amend certain provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 relative to import duties on certain coarse wool, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the

bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CONSTRUCTION OF WATER CONSERVATION PROJECTS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 461, Rept. No. 1315), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 39) to authorize the construction of certain water conservation projects to provide for a more adequate supply of water for irrigation purposes in the Pecos River Basin, N. M. and Tex. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AMENDING THE ORGANIC ACT OF GUAM

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 462, Rept. No. 1316), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4215) amending sections 22 and 24 of the Organic Act of Guam. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous ques-

tion shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

YELLOWTAIL DAM AND RESERVOIR

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 463, Rept. No. 1317), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 2) to provide for transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project, and payment to Crow Indian Tribe in connection therewith, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

INDEPENDENCE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 464, Rept. No. 1318), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1244) to provide for the development by the Secretary of the Interior of Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 465, Rept. No. 1319), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the

Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 912) to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the majority leader if he will tell us the program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday there will be the call of the Consent Calendar, then the bill H. R. 1244, relating to Independence National Park funds.

For Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday there are programed the following bills:

H. R. 8308, a bill relating to the humane slaughter of livestock.

H. R. 2151, regarding import duties on certain wools. I am informed by the chairman of the Committee on Rules that that is a closed rule.

H. R. 4215, a bill to amend the Organic Act of Guam.

Senate Joint Resolution 39, relating to the Pecos River project.

H. R. 8290, a bill authorizing the erection of the Freedom Shrine at a location in the vicinity of Washington.

Any further program will be announced later. I make the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time, although I know of none at the present time.

Mr. ARENDS. May I ask the gentleman if those bills will necessarily follow in the order in which the gentleman gave them to us?

Mr. McCORMACK. I would not want to be bound by that order, but that is my present intention.

On Monday, if there is any rollcall on the rule, of course the rollcall will have to take place. If the gentleman wants to arrive at an understanding that if there is any rollcall on the bill that is coming up on Monday it will go over until Tuesday, I would make that agreement with the gentleman.

Mr. ARENDS. I think that would be all right.

Mr. McCORMACK. All right; I make that agreement.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the

House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

STRENGTHENING OF AMERICAN EDUCATION

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill to strengthen American education, especially in the critical fields of the sciences, mathematics, engineering, modern foreign languages, and in the teaching of those subjects.

These are the fields in which we must excel. They are the fields generally in which we have been falling behind. They are vital to our national defense.

Alabama's distinguished senior Senator, LISTER HILL, is sponsoring this bill in the Senate. I also understand that other senators have joined him as cosponsors.

My bill provides 40,000 scholarships annually for a period of 6 years.

It provides a system of loans for deserving students.

It provides for work-study programs for undergraduate students.

It provides financial assistance to States and institutions of higher education for acquiring science teaching facilities.

It provides summer school and extension courses for teachers.

It provides 1,500 graduate fellowships annually.

It provides assistance to the States for guidance and counseling programs in secondary schools.

It provides a grant for subject matter consultants for high school teachers in the critical fields.

It sets up an institute to assist research in educational television.

It provides Congressional citations for outstanding scholastic achievement by high school graduates.

It provides for an expansion of the programs in order to train technicians in fields essential to national defense.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I include a more comprehensive explanation of the provisions of the national defense education bill.

EXPLANATION OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION BILL

To strengthen education at all levels, the proposed bill provides stimulation and assistance in various categories, as follows:

FOR STUDENTS

First. National defense scholarships: 40,000 new scholarships of \$1,000 each are granted each year for 6 years to high school graduates selected on merit by State commissions, with special consideration to students with superior capacity and preparation in science, mathematics, or modern foreign languages. Each recipient of a scholarship who

maintains proficiency in his studies will receive \$1,000 for each of his college years. By the fourth year of the program, 160,000 college students will be receiving scholarships annually. A total of 240,000 students will receive scholarship grants during the 6-year program and its subsequent 3-year phaseout, at a total cost of at least \$960 million.

The purpose of these Federal scholarship grants is to reward merit, proficiency, and ability, and to stimulate students during their early high school years to do their best and take the hard courses. They will also stimulate parents to insist that high schools give science and language courses, and so forth, and employ qualified teachers.

Twenty thousand additional scholarships, to be granted on a similar basis, are authorized for the first year of the program to students already attending college, at a cost of \$20 million.

Second. National defense student loans: \$40 million is authorized for each of 6 years for loans to needy college students in amounts not exceeding \$1,000 per student per year. Preference is given to students whose academic background indicates superior capacity and preparation in science, mathematics, engineering, or foreign languages. The loan is repayable at 2-percent interest, starting 1 year after completion of higher education, and must be repaid within 10 years. If, however, the borrower serves as a full time teacher, the loan is canceled at the rate of 20 percent for each year he teaches. Thus in 5 years as a teacher, the student-borrower will have had his college loan wholly forgiven.

Third. Work-study program: Grants totaling \$25 million for each of 6 years are made to institutions of higher education to provide needy undergraduate students jobs in the institution, to the maximum extent practicable in work relating to their studies. The preference concept in regard to science, mathematics, and so forth, is followed. The institutions match the Federal funds on a 50-50 basis.

Fourth. Congressional citations: Congressional citations for outstanding scholastic achievement are awarded annually to high-school graduates throughout the country who rank scholastically in the highest 5 percent of their graduating class.

Fifth. Fellowships: 1,000 fellowships in the first year and 1,500 in the 5 succeeding years will be granted graduate students who are preparing to become teachers in colleges and universities. Fellowship stipends for living expenses are paid for 3 years on a rising scale, plus additional amounts for each dependent. An individual awarded a graduate fellowship is also paid amounts necessary to cover the cost of instruction at the institution he is attending.

Sixth. Expanded vocational education program: An authorization of \$20 million a year is made available to the States to encourage the further promotion and development of area vocational education programs in occupations essential to national defense. The allocation of these funds guarantees immedi-

ate expansion of vocational training for technicians and needed skilled workers.

FOR TEACHERS

First. Summer school courses: Grants amounting to \$75 million a year are made in each of 6 years for paying teachers who take advanced studies in summer sessions at institutions of higher education. Each teacher selected by his State educational agency to take such courses receives a stipend of \$75 a week plus \$15 a week for each dependent. In selecting teachers, special consideration is being given those seeking advanced studies in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages.

Second. Extension courses: Grants of \$25 million a year in each of 6 years are made teachers who take advanced studies in extension courses offered in institutions of higher education. Such teachers receive stipends of \$7 a day for each day they attend such courses with a ceiling of \$56 per month.

The purpose of these two programs is to improve teachers' knowledge of subject matter that they teach and to assist them to obtain higher academic degrees and thus qualify for higher salaries.

Third. Institute in guidance and counseling: For contract arrangements with institutions of higher education \$6 million is authorized for each of 6 years to provide for summer institute courses to secondary school teachers in the counseling and guidance of secondary school students, particularly emphasis on gifted students. Stipends of \$75 a week plus \$15 per week for each dependent are paid teachers attending these courses. Tuition and fees are also paid for by the Federal Government.

FOR TEACHING FACILITIES

First. Grants of \$40 million to be matched on a 50-50 basis are made annually for 6 years to State educational agencies for the acquisition of science or language teaching facilities—laboratory equipment, and so forth—for use in elementary and secondary public schools. This helps schools to obtain equipment needed in laboratory work for physics, chemistry, biology, and languages.

Second. Grants of \$40 million for each of 6 years are made to institutions of higher education to pay 50 percent of the cost of acquiring science and language-teacher facilities to be used primarily for undergraduate students.

STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES

First. Guidance and counseling: Grants of \$15 million for each of 6 years are made to State educational agencies to assist in establishing programs of guidance and counseling in secondary schools, to identify students with outstanding mental ability, advise them of courses of study, encourage them to complete secondary schooling, and to take the necessary courses for admission to college, and enter college after completing secondary schooling.

The guidance and counseling program is the foundation on which are based the later scholarship, loan and other financial aid programs for students. Once a gifted student is identified and properly guided through high school, he will qualify to compete for the scholarships and,

when he enters college, be prepared to go forward developing his talents to the maximum.

Second. Science, mathematics, and language consultants: Grants of \$10 million for each of 6 years are made to State educational agencies for programs to make available to science, mathematics, and language teachers in secondary schools information about advances of knowledge and current teaching methods, devices, and textbooks in their fields. This program will strengthen high school teaching of courses in these important subjects, and thus assure that students taking such courses as a part of their college preparation will have the benefit of the best possible instruction.

For research and experimentation:

First. Institute for research and experimentation in new educational media: An institute is created in the United States Office of Education for research and experimentation to develop and evaluate projects involving television, radio, motion pictures, and other auditory and visual aids which may prove of value in State and local educational agencies and institutions of higher education. Grants in aid may be made to public or nonprofit private agencies or contracts may be made with such agencies for this research.

Second. Materials adapted to new educational media: The Commissioner of Education will acquire motion pictures, kinescopes, video tapes, film strips, slides, recordings, magnetic tapes, radio and TV scripts, and so forth, for adaptation, to be made available upon request to State and local educational agencies.

For these 2 programs, \$5 million is authorized for the first year and \$10 million for the succeeding 5 years.

The bill also establishes a National Advisory Council on Science and Education consisting of the Commissioner of Education, the Director of the National Science Foundation, and 12 members appointed by the President by and with the advice and the consent of the Senate. The members shall be broadly representative of the organizational and professional interests in science and education and of the public.

Mr. Speaker, I have outlined the provisions of my bill. I call it the national defense education bill. It is comprehensive. It undertakes to meet the most severe present needs of education. It is an emergency bill.

The bill is practical. It provides Federal aid only in those areas where such aid will be fruitful.

My bill is safe. At every point local, State and institutional control of education is maintained, preserved, and guaranteed.

My bill is urgent. As a Nation, we can no longer tolerate the waste of our intellectual talent. We must provide an opportunity for every good mind to enter America's arsenal of brains.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will stimulate a mighty upsurge in the quality and quantity of our education. It has no compulsion. It is voluntary. It provides opportunity. Our democratic system will do the rest. Our Nation will be supreme

in science and technology. That is the way it should be. That is the way it must be.

MIGRATION

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received the following telegram from my good friend, the hard-working United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Mr. August R. Lindt:

The Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

It is with great pleasure I am able to inform you that the last visas to Hungarian refugees in Yugoslavia have been issued. In addition to feeling a great sense of gratitude to all governments and organizations who have assisted in accomplishing this achievement, I want to express to you my personal gratitude for your interest and efforts in this behalf. The attainment of this goal would not have been possible without the valuable cooperation of the United States Government and yourself.

Sincerely,

AUGUST R. LINDT,
United Nations High Commissioner
for Refugees,
GENEVA, SWITZERLAND.

It is with considerable pleasure and satisfaction that I wish to advise the House of the successful completion of a difficult migration program, undertaken by 26 countries in order to provide a safe haven and resettlement opportunities for the heroic Hungarian freedom fighters who sought temporary asylum in Yugoslavia after the historic uprising in Hungary was brutally crushed by the iron fist of Soviet Russia.

In July 1957 I was asked by the Department of State and by Gen. Joseph M. Swing, the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, to proceed to Yugoslavia on a rather hurriedly arranged special mission for the purpose of advising the interested authorities what could be done in order to evacuate the Hungarian refugees from Yugoslavia where—although well received—they remained in a rather precarious situation.

I found that there were at that time in Yugoslavia 19,851 Hungarian refugees. The great majority of them were young men, intelligent and healthy. They not only participated in the fighting which took place in the streets of Budapest, but for some time after the rebellion was crushed by Soviet tanks they continued fighting in the southern provinces of Hungary, slowly retreating toward the border of Yugoslavia, which they eventually crossed.

I visited numerous camps in which the Yugoslav authorities placed the Hungarian refugees. I talked to a great many of these brave young men, and I found them to be of a fiber quite different from that of which most of their countrymen whom I met in Austria were made. Among the Hungarian refugees in Yugoslavia there was hardly an opportunist to be found who, like in the

majority of the cases with which I became acquainted during my mission to Austria in November 1956, simply grasped the opportunity of an open frontier and crossed it, seeking economic betterment rather than safety from the wrath of those who sought to punish the participants of a crushed rebellion.

During my stay in Yugoslavia and as soon as I returned home, I urged the Attorney General to use the applicable provisions of the Walter-McCarran Act and generously to admit a sizable number of the real Hungarian freedom fighters from Yugoslavia to the United States under the so-called parole authority.

This recommendation was carried out and—soon—South American countries accelerated their rate of admission of Hungarian refugees from Yugoslavia following the example of several countries of Europe who have also opened their doors to these highly valuable individuals.

Of the total number of 19,851 Hungarian refugees who fled to Yugoslavia, close to 3,000 requested repatriation back to Hungary. Some of those who decided to return to their homeland were adolescents whose parents could not join them either in Yugoslavia or in the free world. Some yielded to the requests of their relatives, who were unable to flee Hungary. However, I wish to stress that there was no forcible repatriation to Hungary. All return movements remained under close scrutiny of Mr. Lindt, the high commissioner, and his staff, stationed in Yugoslavia. Some 900 Hungarian refugees were resettled in Yugoslavia itself, mostly in the Banat Province, where there is a considerable number of old Hungarian rural settlements.

According to information which I received this morning from General Swing, the United States has admitted 2,403 Hungarian refugees from Yugoslavia.

The United States leads the list of countries who have admitted Hungarian refugees from Austria and from countries of second asylum. Similarly, the United States leads the list of countries who have admitted Hungarian refugees from Yugoslavia with France, Belgium, Australia, Canada, and Sweden following in that order.

I believe that the task of resettlement of Hungarian refugees who fled to Yugoslavia could not have been completed speedily and effectively if it were not for the efficient, truly professional job done by the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, an organization of which I am very proud to be one of the cofounders. ICEM has been in charge of all movements of Hungarian refugees by air, by surface vessels, by trains, buses, and even by trucks. ICEM has performed magnificently in processing the refugees and in securing the necessary transportation at the time and the place where there were people to carry from behind barbed wire into freedom. ICEM has added in Yugoslavia one more bright chapter to its history.

Mr. Lindt's telegram to me is a happy message, indeed. It attests to the fact that a difficult job has been well done.

NATURALIZATION LAWS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the present naturalization laws work a great hardship on many older aliens who have lived most of their lives in the United States, and are a credit to this Nation.

I have known cases where they have tried three or four times to become citizens, only to fail before the English language test.

Naturalization officials are well aware of this unfortunate situation, and privately sympathize with the sincere applicants, but while the rigid law remains on the books, there is nothing they can do to lift this barrier.

One old Italian lady came to me seeking my help. It was a great effort for her to explain her hopes and her predicament in a language with which she was not familiar. As I already knew several of her sons and daughters, I nodded understandingly.

She and her husband, as young immigrants, worked hard in the local mills to raise a large family. There was no time for night school. They worked and saved not only to bring up their children but to give them a good education.

One of the boys became a doctor, another an engineer, and one of the girls is now a private secretary to a business executive. All of the boys served in the Armed Forces of our country.

Between work in the mills, and work at home, there was no leisure time for the parents to go to school.

In one generation, and by heroic sacrifice, they educated a family who are a credit to themselves, their parents, and the community.

Now that the one remaining goal of the parents is to become citizens of the United States, they find that they are barred because of their difficulties with a difficult language.

In substance, they are better citizens than some who can trace their American origins for generations, and yet they are denied citizenship because of a technicality.

Under these circumstances, I believe that the Government of the United States should be grateful, and generous, when, as it is clear, these humble people have sacrificed so much because of their faith in freedom.

Therefore, I ask for your support of my bill to amend section 312 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to exempt certain additional persons from the requirements as to understanding the English language before their naturalization as citizens of the United States.

So that any person of good character, who is over 50 years of age and has been living in the United States for periods totaling at least 20 years, may be naturalized without being required to undergo the fear, embarrassment, and failure of a language examination.

In view of their solid contributions to the progress of our country, and the deep

and abiding respect they have for its ideals, we can do no less in return than to raise them to the status of first-class citizens. In most cases it will be appreciated more than if they were born to it.

A constructive law is one that is compassionate; that is concerned with the spirit as well as the letter.

Some laws, conceived in hysteria or intolerance, or under conditions that have changed to a large extent, become self-defeating.

This provision of the naturalization laws, as applied to older aliens who have lived in the United States a long time and for whom the United States is their home, is unrealistic and unfair.

Before they die, let us remove the language barrier, and make them happy and proud by conferring the dignity of United States citizenship upon them.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like the Record to show that I have a personal and pecuniary interest in the passage of H. R. 10021, and therefore when it comes up for consideration later today, in accordance with rule VIII of the House of Representatives, I shall refrain from voting on this measure.

H. R. 10021 has to do with continuing the 1955 income tax formula on life insurance companies. As a trustee and stockholder of a business of this type in addition to abstaining from voting, I should like to make it clear that at no time have I discussed this bill, or expressed an opinion as to its merit to any other Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, mention of the subject of personal conflict of interest impels me to offer the opinion that we do not have an adequate statute or rule covering business interests of Members. It seems to me that voting "present" is not enough. There should be a better procedure of avoiding conflicts of interest and more clearly pointing up existing situations and spelling out proper ethics for legislators.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that Members of Congress should be required by law to divest themselves of investments or business clients, but I certainly would deem it fitting and proper that a full list of such assets or financial relationships should be on file available for public inspection. Likewise it would seem there should be something more in the way of procedure than a moral compulsion on a Member to abstain from voting on legislation under such circumstances. I would favor a declaration as to the nature of any conflict of interest during the vote on each question put.

I raise the question also as to whether bankers should be on committees that consider matters of benefit to banks? Should Members who own farms frame legislation to support the price of crops

they themselves raise, or vote on laws to benefit themselves? And so the whole field of personal interest could be explored by Congress. Certainly the source of retainer fees of lawyer-members and partnership income should be restricted under the Corrupt Practices Act. It is pretty obvious that if I owned an oil well, I should not be free to participate in setting the rates for depletion. Also there is the matter of personal gifts and entertainment. Certainly a very rigid code in this field should be incorporated into the rules covering the personal ethics of Members.

I do not infer, Mr. Speaker, that a source of income or personal benefit would influence any Member's action. However, committees and indeed Members of Congress have raised their eyebrows and also their voices, at times, over situations involving the ethics of members of the executive branch of Government. It seems to me the standard we have set for ourselves is not as high as the standard we have set for others. It should be higher.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I hope the rule covering Members' conflicts of interest may be extended and a method established whereby full and free public scrutiny of facts will be in order and a more detailed declaration prescribed whenever a business interest is involved in a Member's vote. I am sure public opinion supports my position in this matter of ethics.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENT ACT

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, as I did 3 years ago, I have today introduced a bill for extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act.

When I took the same action before, I was convinced that extension of the act was vitally important to our economy and to every citizen of the United States. Today, 3 years later, I am more than ever convinced that this law should be kept on the books, and I believe it should be extended for 5 years to remove uncertainties in the minds of businessmen both here and abroad.

During the past 3 years our country has gone through a period of prosperity never before known in the history of the world. One of the important factors in this high level of income was our export-import trade. For the year just ended we exported \$19.5 billion worth of our products and imported just under \$13 billion from our friends and customers overseas. This trade produced employment for 4,500,000 of our people. During that same period the trade of all free-world countries reached an annual rate greater than \$100 billion.

President Eisenhower has repeatedly stated his belief that the road to peace is the two-way road of international trade. With this I heartily concur.

Leaders of our business and industrial world have gone on record in favor of this bill. Civic organizations, labor organizations, veterans' organizations—the list is too long for me to enumerate here. Suffice it to say that the American people are demanding the continuation of the trade policies of the Eisenhower administration. And the demand is a bipartisan one.

Under these trade policies we have maintained a position of leadership among the nations of the Free World. We must at all costs maintain this leadership if we are to win in the economic warfare being waged against us by the U. S. S. R. The newly developing countries all over the world look to us not for aid but for trade. They must sell their products to us in order to buy from us. If we were to raise a higher wall of tariffs and isolate ourselves behind it, these struggling countries would have to turn elsewhere for the good things of life their people are demanding.

In summation may I say that no more important piece of legislation will come before the Congress at this session. I believe that the vast majority of the people of my own great industrial State of New Jersey favor this legislation, dependent as we are for so much of our prosperity and the resultant employment on that foreign trade which passes up New York Harbor and Delaware Bay. Let us demonstrate to the watching world by passing this legislation that America will maintain its leadership in our great crusade toward peace and prosperity for this Nation and the rest of the Free World.

THE KREMLIN REACTS TO A SOLAR PLEXUS BLOW

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, when we hit the Russians where it hurts, they yell—long and loud. We have had a good example of this recently.

On January 19 I joined with a number of Members of Congress and other distinguished Americans in beaming special messages to the people of the Soviet Union. The occasion was the 40th anniversary of Lenin's destruction of the freely elected Russian Constituent Assembly.

We broadcast over Radio Liberation, the conduit by means of which the American Committee for Liberation contacts those behind the Iron Curtain. These messages were part of the fine educational and informational program being vigorously carried out by the committee. This group is to be highly commended for the splendid work they are doing to get the truth to the Russian people.

The messages on January 19 conveyed the sympathy of all the American people for the ruthless blotting out of democracy in the Soviet Union 4 decades ago.

The Constituent Assembly marked a milestone in the history of the Russian people. For an all too brief period the merciless grip of tyranny was thrust away. In its place arose a democratic parliament representative of the wishes of the people and responsive to their thoughts. It was a legislature anxious to translate the desires of the citizenry into reality.

By giving land to the peasantry, by calling for a democratic peace, and by declaring the equality of all nationalities residing within the Russian Republic, the Assembly made great strides toward giving the people a responsible, democratic form of government.

But the grasping hands of dictatorship were not long absent. In a swift stroke the Marxist executioners beheaded the newborn giant. Unable to win by ballot, they chose to rule by bullet. Gallant patriots who had given the Russian people a government they could truly call their own were mercilessly hunted down and destroyed to satisfy the hunger for power of a few men. It is a hunger for power which still manifests itself today. It remains unsatisfied.

In the place of the Czars rose a regime more ruthless, more efficient in its terror, than the reign of Nicholas II ever pretended to be. In the years that followed, the Communist record of bloody suppression fully lived up to the precedent established in this demolition of democracy.

Thus, the story conveyed in the messages over Radio Liberation was one of great significance to the enslaved masses of the Soviet Union today. But perhaps of even greater significance was the reaction of the masters in the Kremlin to these broadcasts.

The Communist overlords reacted like a paunchy fighter who has just been belted with a good, straight solar plexus blow. First, they doubled up in response to a stroke to their vitals. Then, they started flailing wildly in all directions. In this way, they betrayed the real fear which haunts those who today pull the strings behind the forbidding walls of the Kremlin.

The response came in the form of a lengthy article in *Isvestia*, an official Government publication. It was also beamed over Radio Moscow. Moscow lashed out in pain, fury, and desperate sarcasm at those who had made the broadcasts. Special efforts were made to ridicule Congress, our American institutions, and particularly the Constituent Assembly. The following excerpts from the *Isvestia* article indicate clearly how well this blow for freedom struck home:

It is not the custom to hold gay dances at the bier of a deceased person. Certain Members of the Congress of the United States, in spite of this rule adopted by all civilized peoples, had a gay time at a funeral banquet several days ago. This was the funeral banquet of the Russian Constituent Assembly, which died a peaceful death 40 years ago.

The fate of the Constituent Assembly arouses Soviet people just as much as the snows of yesteryear. They are completely satisfied with the Soviet Constitution and

the all popular elected Soviet Parliament, the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R.

A man who supposes that the bestial persecutions in the United States of America of the Negro population and the disgraceful behavior of the Hoover secret police * * * really are a true expression of democracy is not easy to persuade about anything. Therefore, we shall leave off attempts to inject any amount of common sense.

The attack ran the gamut of emotions, from jeering at those who spoke, to pooh-poohing the significance of the Constituent Assembly and the power of its memory on the Russian people. There was a most revealing—almost pitiable—defense of their own rubber-stamp Supreme Soviet.

I was particularly struck with the claim of universal support for and ecstatic approval of this so-called parliament. Now, if the Kremlin is so sure of the popular enthusiasm for this body, they might explain why they do not simply hold free elections, as we do, and prove it to the world.

The answer is, of course, that the masters of the Kremlin are afraid. They cannot, in a showdown, count on the wholehearted support of the great masses of the people.

Clearly, we have been able to strike a ringing blow. Until these messages were broadcast, this anniversary of Soviet shame went unnoticed in the Government-controlled Russian press. This is one of the most vulnerable points in the Soviet armor—the question of the freedom and representative nature of the present Parliament, as compared with a parliament which was once actually voted into office by the people.

By means of these messages, we made clear the universal human impact of the story of the Constituent Assembly. It is a story as glorious as it is tragic. It is a story which contains the seeds of hope rooted deep in the Russian democratic tradition and the genius of the Russian people.

Mr. Speaker, the ideas and ideals held so courageously by Kerensky and his compatriots are not dead. The broadcasts constituted no funeral. Rather, they served to remind the Soviet people of the giant of democracy that lies chained within them. It is a giant yearning to rise again.

The yearning of the Russian people to be free remains unquenched. And the men in the Kremlin have shown us that they know that fact.

It is my firm impression, based on the reaction to these messages over Radio Liberation, that the regime in power is afraid. The Kremlin is as afraid, as we can be hopeful, that the peoples of the Soviet Union will once again find a way to democracy and freedom and help to build a better world. Let us hope that the example set by the Constituent Assembly will serve as a beacon of hope leading the people of Russia out of the darkness of dictatorship into the light of liberty.

SMALL BUSINESS: AN INVESTMENT IN AMERICA'S STRENGTH

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the distinguished chairman of the Small Business Committee introduced a bill in which I have both a deep personal concern and strong intellectual convictions. This is the bill to create a system of Small Business Capital banks.

I am happy to have been able to participate in the drafting of the bill to create a system of Small Business Capital banks and in the work and study which came before. Since the rules of the House do not permit Members to join in the introduction of a bill, but require that each Member who would put his name to a bill introduce it in his own name, I have so introduced the bill to create a system of Small Business Capital banks. I endorse the bill completely. It presents a most felicitous solution to a most unhappy problem. In fact, I cannot recall a bill so satisfying as this bill. I sincerely hope that both its terms and its high principles will be acceptable to almost everybody. And yet it contains no compromises; it does not ask for half-measures. And what is most satisfactory, the bill meets head on a problem which hangs like an ominous cloud over our country.

PURPOSE OF SMALL BUSINESS CAPITAL BANKS

The Small Business Capital Bank System has but one purpose. That is to create a practical and workable means whereby small business may fairly bid for investment funds. Thus what the bill does is to set up a system of investment banks which will do for small firms what the investment bankers and the organized securities markets such as are centered at Wall Street do for big firms.

Under this System of Small Business Capital banks, a small firm may obtain investment funds in either of two ways. It may obtain loan funds, under specified terms for repayment and at a specific rate of interest. Or the small firm having attractive stock and good earning prospects may sell stock to the System, in which case the System will hold an equity in the assets of the firm and share in the firm's earnings.

Capital funds advanced under this System will involve higher risks or longer terms for repayment than the existing capital market is willing to finance for small firms. Indeed, that is the whole purpose of establishing the new System, to provide the kind of service that is so much needed and not now available. This being true, there are two features of the bill which, to my mind, are essential to the success of this System. First, financing decisions will be made by local investment associations, comprised of local citizens who will back their judgments with a portion of their own money.

Second, provision is made for local investment groups to build up private capital in the System, to return the Government funds and take over complete ownership and management of the System. This it seems to me is the main objective, and the only real solution to the problem. What we are trying to do

here is to get started a private-enterprise service which will stand on its own feet and make a profit by supplying a needed service where none now exists.

NOT A STOPGAP MEASURE

In recent years the Federal Government has operated several programs for making loans to small firms, such as in the Smaller War Plants Corporation, the RFC, the Small Defense Plants Administration and now the Small Business Administration. But these have all been stopgap measures, taken because of the extreme urgency of the problem. A Federal bureau making loans to individual small businesses was never intended, I think, to offer any permanent solution to the problem.

Now, how will the funds to capitalize these small business capital banks be raised? Some Federal funds are called for—approximately \$150 million, which is a most modest amount considering the purpose they are to serve. As has been pointed out, use of these will not require appropriations, and it will not increase the Federal debt.

The bill calls for the transfer of certain funds from the Federal Reserve System which are not now earning interest. These consist in part of the uncommitted portion of the funds provided in 1934, under section 13 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, from which the reserve banks were to make loans to small firms. The Federal Reserve Board feels that the Federal Reserve System is the wrong agency to operate this program, and the Board has recommended to Congress, within recent months, that the Federal Reserve System be relieved of both the program and the funds. It is entirely appropriate, then, that the funds be transferred to a place where they will be used to carry out the objective for which they were provided.

In addition, the bill calls for transfer of \$10 million from the surplus account of each of the Federal Reserve banks. These accounts, as I understand it, have been accumulated from interest payments on United States Government securities.

Just as an item for comparison, I will insert in the Record a summary table of the United States Government's appropriations and commitments for foreign aid.

Summary of appropriations and commitments of Federal funds for foreign assistance to July 1, 1958

Program:	Millions
Mutual security (economic, military and technical assistance).....	\$73,598
Export-Import Bank.....	5,000
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.....	635
International Monetary Fund.....	2,750
International Finance Corporation.....	35
Development Loan Fund.....	300
Total.....	82,318

NOTE.—\$150 million for the Small Business Capital Bank System would amount to two-tenths of 1 percent of above total.

SMALL BUSINESS NEEDS OPPORTUNITY—NOT A HANDOUT

Now I should like to dwell briefly on the nature of the problem which this bill

is intended to solve. The problem is not a new one. We have known for a long time that there is a need for some institutional mechanism whereby small firms can bid for the available investment funds. Small firms with good earning records and bright prospects cannot find—at any reasonable cost—the investors who would invest in their stocks and share in the fortunes of the firm. Nor can the investors—at reasonable cost—find and get to know the small firms. The same is true with reference to loan capital where the risk is somewhat greater, or the term for repayment longer, than is the case of loans which commercial banks can make. This is a basic, chronic condition that is crippling to the whole community of small firms, both old ones and new ones yet to be founded. The subcommittee of the Small Business Committee of which I am chairman has run up against this hard and disheartening fact everywhere we have turned.

Every problem we have investigated traces back at least in part, to this problem of obtaining adequate amounts of capital. The problem is rapidly growing more acute, and it will continue to do so. Every year, almost every month, it takes more capital equipment for a business firm to carry on a given volume of business, to say nothing of increasing and expanding the volume. More machines are needed, more office equipment, and more labor-saving devices of all kinds. This is as it should be. No one would wish our business enterprises to be run by hand methods. Yet during the last several years of business prosperity, with business firms generally investing in unprecedented amounts of capital for modernization and expansion, small firms have not been able to keep pace. They could not obtain the necessary capital funds. And small-business failures have been increasing.

OUR ECONOMIC SYSTEM IS AT A CROSSROADS

Dun & Bradstreet reported 333 business failures last week, which was the greatest number of failures in any week since 1940.

In the whole of last year, there were 13,739 business failures according to Dun & Bradstreet's count. Also, according to Dun & Bradstreet's count, these failures amounted to a failure rate of 52 failures for each 10,000 firms in operation. This was the highest rate of failures in 16 years. The failure rate last year—not the number of failures, the rate—was 8 percent over the rate of the previous year; and the rate of the previous year was 15 percent over the rate of the year before that.

Let me call the Members' attention to this: the Dun & Bradstreet figures by no means include all the firms that go out of business. They do not include firms that voluntarily close their doors. They are figures only for firms that either go bankrupt, or that are closed under such circumstances that Dun & Bradstreet estimates a significant loss to creditors will be involved.

Now, does this record suggest that small business is, on the whole, a poor investment? No; it is just the other way around. It is for the very reason that small firms cannot obtain adequate

capital that many of these firms are failing.

It seems clear to me that we have reached a crossroads. Either we take affirmative measures to maintain in this country a broad opportunity for free enterprise, or we accept the proposition that we are right in speeding on toward an economic system made up of a few vast corporate states, run by unseen and unknown governments.

LOW TAXES OR HIGH TAXES—SMALL FIRMS NEED CAPITAL

Now, when this problem of small-business financing is discussed the question frequently comes up. "Wouldn't it be better to give small business tax relief?" The answer is that appropriate small-business tax relief, which I earnestly hope will be given, is not an alternative to this bill to create a system of small business capital banks. This problem of small-business financing is one of long standing, and it will remain whether taxes are high or low; and in either case, the problem will continue to cry for correction.

I have introduced a bill on small-business taxes, and I have been before the Ways and Means Committee in this session of Congress and urged that committee's early consideration of this matter. But neither my tax bill nor this bill to create a system of Small Business Capital banks is intended as any kind of relief measure or grant-in-aid to small business. I am not in favor of anyone paying less than his fair share of the taxes; and I would not propose less than a fair share for small business. It is unmistakably clear to me, however, that the present tax structure has a discriminatory impact on smaller business firms, and this badly needs correction.

EXPANDING ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY IS A FEDERAL TRADITION

Furthermore, the bill to create a system of Small Business Capital banks is in no sense a relief measure. It is a sound investment in free enterprise, and it is in the best tradition of our Federal Government, from its very beginnings. In every year of this Government's existence it has done things, and sought things to do which would create or expand opportunities for economic ventures. These have all involved some costs, and the costs have all been incurred at some risk that the ventures would not succeed. Indeed, when the roads and the railroads were opened to the West it was at a risk that the settlers might not succeed in establishing themselves on the land.

The first Federal assistance to the airlines was given at a risk that travel by air might not become a reality. Federal grants for developing civilian uses of atomic energy today are being made at the risk that this activity may fail.

There is also a risk that this Small Business Capital bank bill will result in some out-of-pocket cost to the Federal Government; there is a risk that small business will fail and that some other system of economic organization will take its place. As for my part, I believe that what is at stake here is clearly worth that risk. I am confident that small business is worth the risk.

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CONTEMPORARY ARTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCormack). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, when by our good works we have won the hearts and the minds of people everywhere, we will have proved the worth of our world leadership. Anything that can contribute to that end is well worth our effort.

As a Chicagoan, I was happy that from the gathering of a small group in Chicago came the inspiration for the classics of American democracy program. Now in all the languages and dialects are being translated the books that were read by our forefathers and in which they found the chart for the establishment of government in more perfect form than man had ever known. Today men and women in lands where there is hunger for freedom and dignity are reading these classics of our democracy with the same fervor as they were read by early Americans. This program is a contribution to the crusade to win the hearts and minds of people everywhere.

As a Chicagoan, I am happy that in the dynamic and far-visioned administration of Mayor Richard J. Daley, there is now in the planning stage, a project of tremendous promise to bring into closer and warmer understanding our people with the people of Latin America. On Mayor Daley's initiative, a Latin-American festival is to be held in connection with the holding of the Pan American Games in 1959. For 1 month the music, the art, the literature, and the technology of the great American Republics that lie to the south of us will be featured in the second city in population in the United States, and on a scale never before approached. This is certain to bring into closer understanding the people of our Middle West with the people of the countries of Latin America. It is a contribution to the crusade in which we are engaged to win the hearts and the minds of people.

Today I have asked for time to announce to the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States the establishment in Chicago of the headquarters of the new International Institute of Contemporary Arts. The purpose is to aid young and unknown artists, composers, and writers. The Chicago Daily News, sensing the significance in the formation of this organization, stressed in an editorial its influence in creating greater international understanding. The City Council of Chicago adopted resolutions expressing the welcome and cooperation of the people and government of Chicago.

This is a contribution to our crusade to win the hearts and minds of people everywhere. In broadening cultural horizons it will narrow the area of baser things that divide. Art, which reflects the beauty of life, coupled with the opportunity offered by this new international organization for recognition for everyone in every land in whom is love of beauty and creative talent, well can serve to bring into ever closer understanding the peoples of the world. I

commend the Honorable Barnet Hodes and the renowned artists and art patrons of Europe and America associated with him for this inspiring contribution to the crusade to win the hearts and minds of people everywhere.

The editorial from the Chicago Daily News of December 19, 1957, follows:

FOR STRUGGLERS

Barnet Hodes, the Chicago lawyer, is chief organizer and first secretary-treasurer of the new International Institute of Contemporary Arts, established in Chicago to aid young and unknown artists, composers, and writers.

American and British art lovers, many of them in positions of prominence, have joined in the enterprise. They plan to encourage artistic endeavor by awarding grants and scholarships and by sponsoring international exhibits of the work of the so-called struggling artists who have something to say.

We commend Hodes and his associates for their efforts, which should contribute not only to the arts but also to greater international understanding.

Following is the news article from the Chicago Daily News of December 18, 1957:

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE SETUP—LAUNCH PLAN TO AID YOUNG ARTISTS, WRITERS, COMPOSERS—SEEKS UNKNOWN WITH TALENT

(By Barnard K. Leiter)

A new international organization of art lovers with headquarters in Chicago soon will launch a search for young, unknown artists, writers, and composers to befriend.

The International Institute of Contemporary Arts will be looking for new people in the Free World "who have something to say either in art, literature, or music," said Barnet Hodes, Chicago attorney and art collector.

Hodes is secretary-treasurer of the institute.

"The established artists really don't need our help," Hodes explained. "It is the young people—the so-called struggling artists who have something to say—that we want to encourage through scholarships and grants."

Hodes just returned from a month in Europe where he worked out details of the organization with a group of other Americans and British persons in the arts world.

At the official formation of the group in Paris 3 weeks ago, Mrs. Roland Penrose, American-born writer, photographer, and art collector, was named president. William N. Copley, a native of Aurora and a director and foreign correspondent for the Copley Press, is vice president.

One of the first items on Hodes' agenda was a conference with Sir Herbert Read, distinguished British critic of art and literature, who is an adviser to the group.

Read, who has been lecturing at the University of Illinois this month, came to Chicago to discuss institute plans with Hodes.

In addition to grants and scholarships, the institute plans to exhibit contemporary paintings, sculpture and allied fine arts on an international scale.

"We don't intend to buy paintings and hide them away in museums," Hodes explained.

"We want to take the paintings that best represent the contemporary artists of the free world and put them on display so the Americans will know what the French are doing and the Germans will know what the Americans are doing in this field."

Hodes said the group also plans to hold annual international art workshops and symposiums rotating in the capitals of the

Free World to promote a better international understanding among contemporary artists.

Other plans include selecting annually outstanding national and international artists for special recognition.

Hodes said the international institute will work closely with the Institute of Contemporary Arts of London and a similar organization in Brussels.

"Both the American ambassadors in France and England have expressed a keen interest in the organization," Hodes said.

"And in addition to Read, our advisers include Picasso, artists Man Ray and Max Ernst, French composer Darius Milhaud, French poet Michel Leiris and sculptor Jean (Hans) Arp."

Hodes said membership in the group will be solicited here, in New York, San Francisco, London, Paris, Brussels, and all the leading cities in the Free World.

He estimated that the first grants and scholarships will be given within a year.

Hodes is a member of the law firm Arvey, Hodes & Mantynband, 1 North La Salle, and former head of the city's legal department.

The following resolution was adopted unanimously by the city council of Chicago:

Whereas:

1. On November 21, 1957, the International Institute of Contemporary Arts was incorporated in the State of Illinois as a not-for-profit corporation for the chartered purposes of promoting international understanding, appreciation and development of and education in fine arts generally and contemporary art particularly.

2. The fulfillment of the objectives of the organization will be accomplished by the following, among other, activities:

(a) Arranging exhibitions on an international scale of contemporary paintings, sculpture, and allied fine arts;

(b) Staging and rotating in capitals of the free world of annual international workshops and symposia;

(c) Close cooperation with the Institute of Contemporary Arts in London and similar groups in other countries;

(d) Grants to artists, composers, and sculptors whose work is deemed to be of international significance;

(e) Compilation of international lists of private and public collections of the contemporary arts.

3. Among those who have already agreed to serve as advisers to the International Institute of Contemporary Arts are:

Sir Herbert Read, internationally known art historian, author, and president of England's Institute of Contemporary Arts.

Darius Milhaud, internationally known composer. Head of the French National School. Teaching professorships at the School of Music, Aspen, Colo., Mills College at Oakland, Calif., and universities of France.

Picasso, recognized as the world's outstanding painter.

Jean (Hans) Arp, world recognized sculptor.

Le Corbusier, internationally famous architect and city planner.

Roland Penrose, officer for fine arts at the British council in Paris and world known art collector and writer.

Max Ernst, internationally known painter, recognized as the head of the surrealist school.

Lord Harewood (George Henry Lascelles) seventh earl of Harewood, chairman of the music advisory committee in England, and member of the executive committee of the British council.

Man Ray, world known photographer and artist, inventor of the Rayograph.

Michel Leiris, outstanding French poet.

4. The officers of the International Institute of Contemporary Arts will be:

President, Mrs. Roland Penrose, American-born writer, photographer and art collector.

Vice president, William N. Copley, native of Aurora, Ill. Director and foreign correspondent of the Copley newspaper and radio chain and president of the William and Noma Copley Foundation, a charitable and educational enterprise.

Secretary-treasurer, Barnet Hodes, former alderman of Chicago, former corporation counsel of Chicago, attorney and art collector.

And whereas the Chicago Daily News on December 19, 1957, expressed its commendation of the International Institute of Contemporary Arts and its founders in the following editorial:

"FOR STRUGGLERS

"Barnet Hodes, the Chicago lawyer, is chief organizer and first secretary-treasurer of the new International Institute of Contemporary Arts, established in Chicago to aid young and unknown artists, composers, and writers.

"American and British art lovers, many of them in positions of prominence, have joined in the enterprise. They plan to encourage artistic endeavor by awarding grants and scholarships and by sponsoring international exhibits of the work of the so-called struggling artists who have something to say.

"We commend Barnet Hodes and his associates for their efforts, which should contribute not only to the arts but also to greater international understanding."

And whereas the position and prestige of the city of Chicago as a great cultural center with its world-recognized universities, art institute, museums, orchestra hall, opera house, and other institutions of culture will be enhanced by the addition of the International Institute of Contemporary Arts with its splendid objectives above described: Therefore be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Chicago, That a warm welcome be extended to the International Institute of Contemporary Arts, that the organization be assured of every possible cooperation; that all of its founders, leaders, and advisers be congratulated; that Barnet Hodes, our former colleague, especially be commended for taking so active and important a role in the organization of this worldwide group, and that best wishes of the city of Chicago be extended for the successful fulfillment of all the laudable purposes of the International Institute of Contemporary Arts; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this meeting, that a copy of this resolution be sent to each of the officers and advisors of the International Institute of Contemporary Arts and that an engrossed copy hereof be sent to the secretary-treasurer of the organization.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and privilege to join my distinguished colleague, Congressman BARRATT O'HARA, from the Second District of Illinois, in applauding the achievements of our great city of Chicago in its latest international achievement. Chicago has been, and continues to be, the pace setter in the United States for eliminating barriers of geographical distance by incorporating herself as the keystone of internationally sound projects. Chicago has paved the way in Latin American

relations with the Pan-American Games and Latin American Festival starting on August 22, 1959. Recognizing the growing need of aiding budding young artists, the Chicago City Council passed a farsighted resolution to center the headquarters of the International Institute of Contemporary Arts in our city.

This contribution to increase international understanding places focus on this great city of the Midwest as a beacon in the American search for international good will.

That great Chicagoan Barnet Hodes is likewise to be congratulated on his most recent efforts on behalf of humanity and Chicago.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join my distinguished colleague from Chicago, the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA, in commending the great city of Chicago and its governing body for this farsighted action. We all know there is an increased emphasis on international understanding through the exchange of people and the exchange of culture. Only the other day the President announced a very heartening agreement which had been made with the Soviet Union for cultural exchange. There has been entirely too little recognition of contemporary American art in the United States. This is a harbinger of better things to come. To my thinking, and I know the gentleman agrees with me, here in the capital of the Free World there is really no place as yet for the performing arts and for the display of contemporary art in any of its forms. It is something which the Capital of the United States needs very badly. Chicago can be extremely proud of its cultural plans and I am sure the Nation will be proud of what Chicago is doing.

What Chicago is doing is inspiring and, I hope, will encourage other cities to follow her example.

The Junior Chamber of Commerce of Trenton, N. J., in my own district, has undertaken the sponsorship of an arts and music festival the middle of next month, February, featuring Louis Armstrong and other outstanding cultural attractions.

What is taking place in Chicago, Trenton, and in other cities across our country is a marriage of business, local government, and the arts. St. Louis has its Municipal Opera, and Dallas its music under the stars. There are the concerts in the Hollywood Bowl and other cities are following these proud examples.

There can be no doubt, I think, but that our people have an enormous interest and enthusiasm for cultural values and cultural activities. I think this has always been the case in America.

That early observer, Alexis de Tocqueville noted it in his book *Democracy in America*.

The Mormons took music with them to the West.

There were music and theater performances in our first mining camps and opera houses were among the first permanent structures put up in the nearby towns and cities.

America has never known court patronage of the arts which was so much a part of the European tradition and experience with cultural matters. And we are the better for it. The arts belong to the people here.

The cultural life in almost any American city of any size is, in my judgment, one of the phenomena of the high standard of American life. The radio and television, the movies, the theater and music departments of our schools, colleges, and universities, the civic interest in art expressed in a thousand ways, as in Chicago, these are a major force in American life. Our cities contribute such institutions as symphony orchestras and concert halls where the paid admissions are greater by several millions of dollars a year than the admissions receipts at baseball games. There are several hundred—more than 400, in fact—art museums each with thousands of members.

In our period art is a major staple of such magazines as *Time*, *Life*, *Look*, and *Newsweek*, all of which devote many columns weekly to the theater, the concert halls, and so on.

Today education and the arts are provided free over radio and television by Ford, General Electric, Goodyear, Firestone, Westinghouse, Du Pont, Union Carbide and hundreds of other companies.

The sensitivity of the officials of our cities and of American business to a genuinely culture-conscious people is one of the significant social phenomena of our time. The businessman, I imagine to his own amazement, has found a new bonanza of public relations and commercial approach. And this approach is via the medium of the dissemination of the richest materials in western civilization—the fine arts. This is a potential of such significance to the progress of mankind that we here are far too close to its present development to adequately appreciate its importance to our own times, or the future.

Instead of lamenting this, I think our businessmen and the broadcasting companies should be encouraged to do more. Hollywood should be encouraged to make more adult and beautiful art movies instead of the awful potboilers of the past. Let us here help confirm the new-found cultural interests of the American businessman, the civic leader, the Mayor Daleys of a thousand cities from Louisville, Ky., to New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Boston, St. Louis, Dallas, and Hollywood. Let us welcome all who have had the faith, the imagination, the brains and the courage to risk huge sums to back the cultural riches of our civilization. We have all benefited. I hope it will continue to be a part of the American tradition.

I congratulate the gentleman on his effort today, and especially those who have brought this about.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include a news article and an editorial from the Chicago Daily News and a resolution passed by the City Council of Chicago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Member who desires to do so may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the very able and distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA], on the leadership that he has taken to have the classics of American democracy translated in foreign languages so that the people of the world who are struggling to maintain and to achieve individual liberty and freedom may know just what ideas motivated the Founding Fathers of our great country. Mr. O'HARA realizes the importance of winning the hearts and minds of people throughout the world in their struggle for individual liberty, the dignity of the person, and the right of nations to govern themselves—to determine their own destiny and not to be pawns and slaves of Russian Communist tyranny and exploitation or any other form of imperialism or exploitation. One big problem confronting us is to get translations in as many major languages of the world of the classics of American democracy at a price which the ordinary people of these many countries can afford to pay. The United States Information Agency has made a fine start in this direction but the tempo must be speeded up to accomplish the goal which we all agree is most desirable, mainly to win the hearts and minds of people and to enable them to enjoy the basic human freedoms for which we all were created.

It was my privilege to discuss with Mr. Barnet Hodes of Chicago, about his own and Mr. O'HARA's efforts in this direction. I wish to compliment him and his associates in their efforts also to encourage youth in developing the arts.

I believe the Chicago Daily News is also to be commended for the outstanding support that newspaper has given to the effort made to get the classics of American democracy into the hands of the politically awakened people of the world. The initiative taken by that newspaper from the very beginning of this project has been a source of great encouragement to all of us who have had the privilege of furthering this objective.

Mr. O'HARA has recently made an intense study of this problem in the Middle East and Africa and I am confident that his efforts are bearing fruit. I am sure that all of his colleagues applaud him and are willing to assist him in his efforts.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in congratulating the great city of Chicago on another outstanding contribution to the cause of international relations. I especially commend the Hon. Barnet Hodes and the group of artists and art patrons for extending recognition to young artists. On every ground we shall meet and surpass the Soviet, leaving them hopelessly behind. We are also not forgetting the cultural things that give breath to human dignity. Last year a subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee made a nationwide survey of public opinion and held a hearing session in Gary, Ind. I was happy to participate in these hearings. At the conclusion of the Gary hearings, Members told me that they were the most valuable to the committee of all the hearings which they held throughout the Nation. The reason was that in northern Indiana we are vitally interested in the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain and want a foreign policy that will hold hope for their quick liberation. We are very much interested in everything that brings the peoples of the free world closer together. Music, literature, and art composes these mediums that brings for closer union among us.

Again I congratulate our sister city, Chicago, and commend Mr. Hodes and his associates.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to associate myself with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] in urging the establishment in Chicago of the new International Institute of Contemporary Arts.

This project is intended to bring even closer together the peoples of the Midwestern United States and the Latin American countries. We in the Middle West have long enjoyed the friendship of the peoples of countries to the south of us.

It is most fitting that this institute be established in our great metropolis as a means of creating even better international good will.

FEDERAL EXPENSES IN DALLAS COUNTY, TEX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 21 last there appeared a vigorous attack upon me and the District I represent, Texas Fifth. The vehement denunciations by the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] were intended, as he stated, "to set the record straight" and "inform the House the true amount of Federal funds and projects going into this conservative stronghold, Dallas County, Tex." These were to be the facts. To quote briefly:

In Dallas . . . it is popular to condemn Federal grants, loans, or any form of Federal assistance. . . . While the gentleman from Dallas, Mr. ALGER, and the Dallas Chamber of Commerce board of directors

flay Federal aid in all forms, that aid pours into Dallas County in great abundance.

So let the gentleman from Texas, Mr. ALGER, and the Dallas Chamber of Commerce directors, and others of this high oligarchy which prides itself in "controlling Dallas County, cease from their verbal spoutings against Federal aid, while they enjoy the fruits of Federal aid in so many, many ways."

Let this newspaper (the Dallas Morning News) and the chamber board of directors and its Congressman realize, for once, that the Federal Government is here to help, not hurt, our people.

The good people of Dallas benefit from almost every Federal program known to the mind of man.

Either the gentleman from Texas, Mr. ALGER, is opposed to these programs or he is not opposed to them. And if it is the latter, Mr. Speaker, then he should change his speeches to fit his views accordingly.

For the facts are not consistent with Mr. ALGER's published statements.

These are some of the more temperate statements.

The Representative, the newspaper, the chamber of commerce, the city and county officials, lobbyists—all the people of Dallas County were, as you see, tarred with the same brush, as the gentleman sat in judgment of them. Conservative Dallas was pictured as having the hand outstretched to receive all the Federal money possible, while the people and their Representative inconsistently belabored and voted against the Federal programs under which the money was received. We were, therefore, unappreciative, ungrateful, inconsistent, greedy, and, I suppose, following this progression of thought, quite hypocritical. How ridiculous, as to the facts.

But first, should a Member answer an attack in the RECORD, or would this be "two wrongs don't make a right"? Was the gentleman sincere or was this camouflage for some new political undercutting, most of which techniques, refined or coarse, I had already experienced? The obvious falsities, as fallacious as they were vigorously presented, puzzled me.

The plot thickened when the District was circularized with copies of this attack, in Congressional envelopes without return address—thus my office got the returned mail. The envelopes had "Congress of the United States" in the upper left corner, and they were stamped, not franked. This expense in time, effort, and money must have meant a lot to somebody.

Hesitancy to take the valuable time of this House to answer this attack has been replaced by the desire to get the garbled record straight. I have notified the gentleman in writing of my intention.

It is hardly necessary for me to speak for the Dallas Morning News or the chamber of commerce, since they can speak so well for themselves, nor for the accused Dallas lobbyist, who responsibly holds a respectable position with the chamber of commerce, and a dear longtime friend of the Speaker. But there are 850,000 in the Fifth District of Texas whose voice I am in this House. I realize now there is no virtue in silence when both this District and I can,

through this fallacious attack, be misjudged. Further, the facts which I shall present may be of interest to my colleagues, who might otherwise have been misled.

Now, as to the charges—time prevents my discussing them all, although I am prepared to do just that in detail. Now, let us see what are the facts and who is consistent?

First, you should know that the gentleman has made four corrections of the RECORD on his own, which is in the right direction but quite insufficient.

There are other charges, grievously in error, which have not been corrected. First, the weekly newsletter to my constituents, so offensive to him, does not cost \$200 per insertion into the RECORD, as is flatly stated, but costs \$30 to \$40 according to the Government Printing Office. Pondering this charge, I wondered if I were out of line in my use of the RECORD. Some quick research reassured me. I found, for example, that two of the gentleman's California colleagues each inserted twice as much material in the first 2 months of the year as I did all year. Another prominent west coast Democrat had 31 insertions in the same CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as the gentleman's attack—all on the same subject, "Cruelty to Animals"—more in 1 day than I had all year. Or, again on the day the gentleman's last correction appeared, a colleague who shares the gentleman's views had 31 pages—that is \$2,500 worth. Surely I was not out of line. Understand, I am not criticizing, but only comparing.

Further, the newsletter can have some powerful influences for good, even economy—contrary, apparently, to the understanding of the gentleman. It is a cold-blooded fact, and I appreciate this opportunity to mention it, that in one instance a constituent challenged my newsletter figures on intended State Department expenditures. Subsequently, in the exchanges and followup, we succeeded in eliminating a \$27,778 appropriation. This is enough, by the way, to put the newsletter in the RECORD for 27 years.

The overriding criticism frequently expressed or implied was the inconsistency of my position—a conservative in voting, while Federal money went into my District.

Obviously, the gentleman is troubled by the cart-before-the-horse assumption that people who receive Federal money must necessarily be for the program under which they receive the money. By this assumption, any veteran disapproving the particular provisions of a pension bill must refuse the money to which the law entitles him. Or if a pay boost or benefit is deficient in the opinion of a Federal employee, he or she should refuse the increase. This is similar to saying that in a family, should the wife outvote the husband in the matter of home or car, demanding the more expensive, that the husband may not live in the house nor ride in the car, though he is footing the bill. As I see it, he may so live and ride, yet maintain his right to protest and try to convince his wife

and family to vote to reduce expenditures and revert back to the smaller house and car. So it is with legislation, is it not? Just because we strive for the bills we believe in, or try to reduce rather than increase Federal programs, does not mean we should not participate when it is the law, particularly in view of the fact we are helping pay for programs with our tax money.

So let us look at Dallas, taking the gentleman's own specific subjects of criticism, Small Business Administration.

To quote the gentleman:

During the year ending June 25, 1957, the Small Business Administration granted 52 loans in Dallas totaling \$1,849,913 of Federal money, and additional \$69,420 in disaster loans. No protests are filed.

Well, a protest is herewith filed, and it is a protest against statements of this sort being palmed off as facts.

As a matter of fact, a 5-minute phone call to the SBA will elicit the information that during the fiscal year referred to the Small Business Administration made 28—not 52—business loans in Dallas County, totaling \$1,156,230—or about half the alleged amount.

Now it is true that SBA was called upon for disaster loans by individuals in Dallas County. Twenty such loans were made, totaling \$69,320. This fact, too, fills me with pride in my community. Imagine—20 loans totaling \$69,320—about \$3,500 each, on the average.

Surely, everyone recalls that during the period referred to Dallas County was struck by a vicious tornado which was followed in a short period by devastating floods. It was to the first of these disasters that the very esteemed gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] was referring when he addressed this House on April 17 of last year. His tribute to the pluck and self-sufficiency of the people of Dallas, Tex., in the face of adversity was genuinely appreciated:

THE DALLAS TORNADO—EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 17, 1957

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I believe sentiment is growing in America among our States and the local communities to do as much as possible for themselves without calling on the Federal Government. The people of Dallas, Tex., were stricken by a terrible tornado which caused over \$4 million damage and took many lives. It is my understanding that immediately after the tornado struck, insurance adjusters and investigators moved in to take care of the people's claims. Carpenters, brick masons, engineers, and the people in general moved in the next morning and went to work to restore the damaged property. Local contributions of time, money, clothes, and food poured in. A magnificent job was done by the city of Dallas and the State of Texas. It is my understanding that no official request for help to the Federal Government in Washington was ever issued by the local authorities. The people of Dallas will always remember with pride how everyone chipped in and, at the local level, rebuilt the damaged portion of their great city. This is the kind of effort that made America the Nation that it is today. This is the kind of pride, frugality, and thrift which will preserve this great Nation. I congratulate

late the people of the city of Dallas, Tex., on their splendid reaction to a major disaster.

I cannot believe that anyone who did the research through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD clearly evident in the later attack of August 21, could have been unaware of the facts pointed up by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] and of his very gracious remarks concerning them.

Now are the actual SBA figures applicable to Dallas County exorbitant? I do not know, but I hardly think so. It is interesting to note, however, that when the Congress saw fit last year to make SBA's aid a permanent fixture in our national life, I opposed the measure. The gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] did not. The record in debate carries my dissenting statement in which I pointed out the way to help small business is to return their tax money to businessmen, not extend help and then increase taxes to pay for it.

How about the school-lunch and school-milk programs? To quote the gentlemen:

Dallas is a prosperous city. It is a city of wealth and great abundance. Yet, according to the Texas Education Agency in a report dated August 1, 1957, "Dallas County last year received Federal funds in the amount of \$135,437.93 for its school-lunch program. And the Government gave Dallas County a total of \$613,276 in Federal subsidy for its lunch program since 1952, and an additional \$96,941.08 for its school-milk program."

Now the facts. Dallas is indeed opposed to Federal aid. When the school-lunch program was first being sold to Congress in 1946, Dallas' able and respected Hatton W. Sumners was one of those Congressmen who remained unconvinced that the Federal Government could best do all things for all people. As Dallas' Representative in Congress, he opposed the School Lunch Act. Moreover, since that date, the Dallas Independent School District, encompassing all of the city of Dallas and responsible for the education of over two-thirds of the children in the county, has steadfastly declined any school-lunch aid, school-milk aid, or any other Federal largesse, though our people are paying through the nose for this program as are taxpayers everywhere.

School-milk program comparison of States
(Department of Agriculture figures)

	Per capita income	Number of school age children	School-milk grants	
			Fiscal 1957	Fiscal 1958
California.....	\$2,271	2,697,000	\$5,412,500	\$5,952,650
Texas.....	1,614	2,092,000	\$2,100,000	2,018,500

¹ One-third higher.

² Five-fourths higher.

³ Of this allocation, only 40 percent as large as California's, Texas spent only \$1,837,876. The balance is returnable to Federal Government.

Let us sum all this up: According to the gentleman from California, the Federal Government has poured aid into Dallas County since 1946 to the tune of \$613,276 in school lunches and an additional \$96,941 in school milk. This

covers quite a few years, and the periods are overlapping. Any comparison of identical periods, however, might prove interesting: In the school year 1955-56, public schools in Dallas County with an average daily attendance of 116,976 were allocated \$139,190.64 from the school-lunch and school-milk programs. During the same period, according to the California State Controller, the public schools in California's 12th District, which the gentleman represents, and where school attendance is considerably lower than in Dallas, received \$419,261.69—more than 3 times the Dallas County figure. Now just whose hand is outstretched to Uncle Sam?

Next, to quote again:

FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. ALGER recently attacked a flood-control project passed in the district of one of his Texas colleagues, shortly after the area for which it had been passed had suffered a damaging flood. He issued press releases and wrote in his newsletter that he could not in good faith vote to spend Federal money on the project. Where was Mr. ALGER's good faith when the Government was considering a project known as the Dallas Floodway? I did not see him rise to object to the fact that the Federal Government is putting up \$8,996,000 in Federal funds for this project, while the Dallas local government will put up only \$1,400,000.

In addition to the federally financed Dallas Floodway, Dallas directly gets the benefit of 3 other dams, located in adjoining counties, costing a total of 36,123,000 Federal dollars for construction, maintenance, studies, and general operation. The dams were constructed for the primary purpose of helping Dallas citizens. Would Mr. ALGER say to the Government: "Remove these dams, they are not needed nor wanted by the people I represent, because they were constructed by tax funds?"

Now here we have not a simple case of just torturing figures out of all validity. Here I am unable to even locate one of the dams supposedly benefiting Dallas.

True, there are presently three dams of any consequence located on tributaries of the Trinity which affects Dallas. One of them is Benbrook which lies on the other side of Fort Worth from Dallas and about which the Corps of Engineers says:

The Benbrook project is designed to prevent floods similar to the one of May 1949 when vital business and residential areas of the city of Fort Worth were inundated. Eleven people lost their lives in this disaster. Monetary losses were estimated at \$11 million. By preventing this flood alone, the Benbrook project would have paid for itself. In 1956 Congress passed legislation enabling the city of Fort Worth to purchase conservation storage space in Benbrook Reservoir for municipal water supply purposes until such time as storage space should be required for Trinity navigation. A contract for the interim use of this space is now under discussion with the city of Fort Worth.

The other two dams, Grapevine and Lewisville, are indeed of primary benefit to Dallas, both with substantial local contributions. It is interesting to note that the only dam of these three, in which there was no local contribution involved, to the best of my knowledge, is

the Benbrook Dam which the gentleman would have you believe was constructed primarily for Dallas' benefit but which, as a matter of fact, affects us very little if at all.

As to the Dallas Floodway there are 1 or 2 minor corrections necessary in these facts about Dallas County. In its published description of this project the Corps of Engineers points out:

The Dallas Floodway project, construction of which was initiated in January 1953, provides for the strengthening of approximately 23 miles of existing levees, clearing the floodway channel, and improvement of interior drainage facilities. The area within the levee system totals approximately 10,500 acres in the heart of Dallas, near the confluence of Elm Fork and West Fork in the Trinity River. Important businesses, industries, warehouses, transportation and communication facilities, and residential property will be protected by the project.

The existing levees and floodway improvement at Dallas were constructed by local interests during the period 1928 to 1932. Cost of the original project, including rights-of-way, bridges, utilities, etc., has been estimated by local interests at \$20 million. The estimated cost to the Federal Government of the proposed improvement is \$9,086,000 (July 1956 estimate). During the 1957 fiscal year, construction funds in the amount of \$2,600,000 were appropriated for the project. Local cooperation is estimated to total \$1,497,800, of which \$300,000 is a cash contribution toward construction of the Turtle Creek pressure sewer.

The project is expected to be completed during 1958.

By the way, how much would that \$20 million be today?

Having straightened out who has contributed what to this project, let us see if we can determine "where was Mr. ALGER's good faith?" as the gentleman from California asks.

As assiduously as someone combed through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to glean the material for the gentleman's exposé surely he must have come across the fact that funds for completion of the Dallas Floodway were twice included in omnibus public-works bills; and, in each instance, I voted against—not for—these measures. While that might seem remarkable in some schools of politics, it is well understood in Dallas. For while we are convinced of the merit in the floodway, while we have contributed far more on the local level toward its construction than is common these days; while the project has received the blessings of the Corps of Engineers and the Budget Bureau, we in Dallas do not want it if, along with it, the citizens of this country must be saddled with every sort of pork-barrel project, approved by nobody other than each such project's political sponsor.

So I must flatly contradict the gentleman—and point out, consistently speaking, I have the right to oppose others' projects even the Texas San Angelo project of last year, which, as I saw it, asked too much Federal money. I would not vote for it just because it was a Texas project. This was even tougher for me because of my respect and admiration for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] whose project it was. To prove

the point, again in the RECORD, unbeknownst to the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] placed a letter from a Dallas resident commending me for my stand in opposition to certain Federal programs—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 4, page 5303. Among other things this letter states:

Contrary to a great deal of popular opinion, the Congressman who will oppose wasteful or unnecessary Federal expenditures in his own district adds far more to his political strength than he loses. In such a stand, he will inevitably antagonize a selfishly interested minority; but the great majority usually admires his courage, regards him as of increased stature, and forgets the details and votes for him at the next election. The average voter has come to regard him as a man of strength and character without reference to any particular local interests.

The most recent illustration of the foregoing that comes to my mind is BRUCE ALGER's last race here in Dallas County. Incidentally, I am firmly of Democratic persuasion, and supported BRUCE's opponent in the election. Contrary to what a few of us thought was sound politics, the Democratic candidate (no doubt with the hearty approval of a majority of his advisers) tried to capitalize on some of BRUCE's voting in the interest of economy, even at the expense of 1 or 2 Dallas projects, and tried to drive home the point that BRUCE has gotten nothing for this District. The results speak for themselves. Dallas County actually is still strongly Democratic in formal party alignment—a point clearly enough proved in the election last Tuesday. BRUCE nevertheless won his race last summer by what was for this county a heavy majority. I am sure that he was a part of your support mentioned in the attached news clip.

Is not this position consistent? Is not this "putting the money where the mouth is"?

Now, for Love Field, the airport built by Federal dollars. According to the gentleman from California:

Another example of these terrible Federal funds is found in connection with Love Field, a commercial airport located in a heavily populated section of Dallas. The entire project at Love Field was created and constructed outright by the Federal Government at a cost of \$3,412,000, and all told the Government has given \$5,832,109 to Love Field construction, expansion and renovation.

In 1917 the Division of Military Aeronautics leased 650 acres for a military training camp and 60 acres for a landing field from one Urie Jones.

As war surplus it was acquired by a private firm, the Love Field Development Corp.

In December 1927, Dallas taxpayers overwhelmingly approved a \$400,000 bond issue and on June 22, 1928, the city of Dallas used \$325,000 of the proceeds to buy 167.1 acres of land from Love Field Development Corp. for development as a municipal airport. It used the other \$75,000 for purchase of Hensley Field. Hensley, owned by the city, has always been used as a military airport being leased to the Federal Government for \$1 per year.

Since 1927 the citizens of Dallas have invested some \$26.5 million of local funds in Dallas' own Love Field. They have

also received some Federal aid. Let us examine that for a moment:

Under the Federal airport aid program, Dallas' Love Field has received, according to the CAA, \$430,068. Back in the thirties under the New Deal make-work programs, the CWA and the WPA had projects in the area on which the Government placed a book value of \$563,607.

It is interesting to note that CAA approved and allocated \$317,334 of Federal aid to Dallas in December of last year. However, our mayor, a leader of the oligarchy despised by the gentleman from California, wrote the CAA that the improvements contemplated could be accomplished by local funds, as part of a tremendous expansion program now under way. As a matter of fact no Federal aid money has gone into Love Field since 1951 during which time the citizens of Dallas have committed more than \$20 million to their airport's development and expansion.

Now, what of the figures thrown out willy-nilly by the gentleman? Well, what of them? I can get figures from no Government agency which quite jibe with them. I can only assume that they were meant to approximate the initial cost of the temporary wooden structures built by the Federal Government on one segment of Love Field's perimeter, during World War II.

Some of the barracks and so forth were built on land adjacent to the field and acquired from private owners. Is this Federal aid? Some were built on city-owned land which was leased to the Government for \$1 per year. We made no killing that time.

In 1947 the War Assets Administration deeded over the land acquired by the Government to the city of Dallas, together with the temporary structures. At the same time the chapel serving the barracks area was sold to the Christian Science Church for \$1,000. Now, lest anyone think that the buildings involved constituted some sort of Federal aid bonanza, I would point out that the Federal Government came along later and decided that they could use some of them for National Guard and Air Force Reserve training. The city promptly leased the necessary land and buildings back to the Federal Government for \$1 per year. Such was the extent of the Defense Department's contribution to Dallas' Love Field.

Incidentally, when a need arose last year for additional Reserve training space, the city of Dallas leased to the Federal Government another 20 acres of land on the very same basis—a 99-year lease at \$1 per year. In this airport, Redbird, there has never been one crying dime of Federal money. Federal aid?

Now if you pick up the phone and query the Corps of Engineers, and you seek only figures which will bolster your argument, however specious, they will tell you that the Government invested in initial construction costs, several millions of dollars in Love Field. This is Federal aid?

It is the same sort of aid a town receives from an oil driller who sinks several millions into a dry hole on the edge of town. It may have cost him plenty in investment, but when he pulls up his rig and moves on, all the town has to show for it is a hole in the ground.

Now, compare the charge, "the entire project was created and constructed outright by the Federal Government," to the facts that \$26.5 million of Dallas citizens' money—almost the entire expenditure—came from the people of Dallas.

Such has been the extent of Federal aid to Love Field and such is the validity of Mr. Sisk's statement:

AGRICULTURE

Now, for Agriculture, to quote:

According to Charles R. Grant, budget officer of the Department of Agriculture, Dallas County, during fiscal years 1955 through 1957, received \$7,496,000 in Federal money from the Agriculture Department. I believe the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] has been in Congress during that period and although he has said he is opposed to farm subsidies, the records do not show that he has protested 1 penny of the money sent into Dallas County.

Well, if I maintained that only one penny of Agriculture money came into Dallas County, I would be a whole lot closer to the truth than was that statement.

True, after my office and I had pointed out to the newspapers the utter absurdity of these figures, the gentleman from California did cause a correction to be inserted in the RECORD. Just 4 weeks later, he did this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 19, published after everyone had gone home. Needless to say, I am unaware that anyone bothered to circularize my District with any corrections, as they did with the original blast.

Now, let us look at the correction. This is what he said:

FEDERAL AID TO DALLAS COUNTY—EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. B. F. SISK, OF CALIFORNIA, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FRIDAY, AUGUST 30, 1957

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 11, pages 15555-15557 reported my remarks under the heading "Fantastic Federal Aid to Dallas County Revealed." In those remarks I detailed some of the very large Federal Government expenditures in the form of grants, gifts, loans, subsidies, guaranties, and other programs for the benefit of Dallas County, Tex.

Two errors in the figures cited have now come to my attention. Although these inaccuracies did not materially alter the total, I want to be entirely fair in the matter and would, therefore, like to indicate appropriate corrections.

On the basis of information supplied by the Department of Agriculture, I stated Dallas County programs received \$7,496,000 in agriculture funds during the fiscal years 1955 through 1957. The Department now advises that through error it included sums actually allocated to other Texas counties by the Rural Electrification Administration, so that it appears the correct amount should have been \$916,000.

Now, let us go a little deeper into this story. Being the trade center of a vast and fertile area, Dallas quite under-

standably houses a number of offices for various divisions of the Agriculture Department—the Agricultural Marketing Service, Agricultural Research Service, Commodity Stabilization Service, Farmers' Home Administration, and Office of the General Counsel. Remember, too, that the figures cited by the gentleman from California cover a 3-year period. Now, of the first mentioned \$7½ million, almost \$7 million of it was a REA loan to the Texas Telephone & Telegraph Co., whose headquarters are in Navarro County, outside my District, and whose president and principal stockholder lives and maintains his office in Houston.

This loan was aimed at improving existing service and extending new service to over 14,000 subscribers in 21 counties served by 43 exchanges all over Texas. I know little of the merits of this loan, nor do I feel obliged to defend it. The county in north Texas principally benefited is Hunt County, whose people are very ably represented in Congress by the Speaker of the House.

While the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] says these "inaccuracies did not materially alter the total," in this case some fourteen-fifteenths of the money we were talking about never came near Dallas County. Of all the Agriculture Department funds mentioned over the 3-year period, 85 percent of them never even came through Dallas County. And this does not materially alter the total? This correction, like the others, was not circulated throughout the District, as was the attack. Further:

I am also advised that cost figures furnished by the Veterans' Administration covering construction of a veterans' hospital were misinterpreted to indicate real-estate costs of \$10,358,263 which were actually included in total costs of \$11,397,652. The separate real-estate costs should be eliminated.

I stated the incomplete expenditures in Dallas County detailed in my remarks reached the sum of \$902,105,597. With these corrections, the total should be \$885,167,334.

In the citation of VA hospital costs, the figure originally given was only some 90 percent in error as you will note from the gentleman's subsequent correction of that figure, too. This is not a material alteration?

Do not all these facts, replacing the alleged facts, compliment the people of Dallas, showing their willingness to go it on their own, rather than grasping for Federal funds? Are not they and their Representative consistent? I think so.

Maybe there is a difference in our districts. I am convinced that many Dallas citizens see the fallacy of paying heavy taxes to receive Federal money, recognizing that in the long round trip to Washington much is subtracted in Government overhead, and that demanding more and more Federal aid under the guise of something for nothing, or that it is always other people who pay, are just kidding themselves. While others may not agree with me, surely I have the right to encourage and support this viewpoint in my own District.

The gentleman claims to be not anti-Texas nor anti-Dallas. If this is true,

his misstatements certainly misrepresent him. He appears wholeheartedly to be both. I must assume necessarily then, the gentleman is simply anti-ALGER, which animosity I do not reciprocate, or anti-Republican, which is a sentiment I sometimes encounter and with which I am learning to grapple. Or is there another reason?

By politically attacking me with facts clearly erroneous, at the same time charging me with inconsistency, has not the gentleman hooked himself with his own harpoon? The attack, the attendant publicity, and the copies sent throughout the District may indeed sow seeds of distrust against me among those who do not know the record, but such actions also do some good, do they not? The pitiless spotlight of public opinion can reveal falsities and truths. Those colleagues, including Texans, if such there are, who conspired to pare me down to size, have the right to do so if they choose, but I want to assure them all, that they had better not underestimate the intelligence of Dallas citizens. American people, like the majority of Congressmen, are basically fairminded. They prefer truth to political untruths or half-truths or calculated low blows. Low blows? I have been hit in the Appendix.

The larger, more intriguing question keeps puzzling me. Why, why did the gentleman single me out and why the vigorous, even bitter, attack? Mr. Speaker, I regret the need for this statement. However, I do not apologize for my own record or for the fine people of the District I have the honor to represent. Does not the gentleman know that this attack, just possibly, could give me attention and support not mine until the misrepresentations were hurled?

Now, I must speculate that there must be larger reasons than anti-ALGER or anti-Republican. Quite apparent is the great difference there is between the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Texas, beyond the charge and countercharges. The obvious difference is the philosophy held by each as to the role of Federal Government in our lives, as represented by their respective voting records. The difference is as clear as their rating by the ADA yardstick, which gives 100 percent approval of my colleague, and 100 percent disapproval of me. In 3 years I have but one ADA plus mark to my credit, and this was a mistake in a paired vote. The ADA believes, as does the gentleman apparently, in sponsoring every program, as the gentleman says, "known to the mind of man" as a Federal program. This embraces public power, public housing, aid to education, increased foreign aid, more direct and guaranteed Government loans and subsidies, increased grants to States, almost unlimited business enterprises conducted by Federal Government, increased pay and pensions for everyone, increased farm subsidies, increased welfare programs of all kinds, and other new and expensive programs now in the planning stage, as evidenced by the Democrat manifesto of

January 30, 1957, when the budget was labeled too little and too late in all departments. Naturally, these programs would cost an almost unlimited additional expenditure, which means logically higher taxes. Here are some of this year's ADA objectives—as listed in the Congressional Quarterly:

Urge Government spending of \$5 billion to \$10 billion more a year for social and economic welfare and to restore full employment.

Base defense appropriations on security needs, not "predetermined budgets."

Provide Federal aid to schools and colleges; Federal construction grants to schools of at least \$1 billion a year for 10 years; Federal scholarships and fellowships to "several hundred thousand talented students."

Expand Federal programs of urban development and housing, including a 10-year program of not less than \$500 million yearly to aid cities in such development.

Expand program of economic aid to underdeveloped countries; authorize a special loan of about \$600 million to India.

Provide for a meaningful Trade Agreements Act—a long-term program with adequate provisions for the assistance and redeployment of companies and workers who are injured by the expansion of American imports; authorize United States membership in OTC.

Create a Presidential committee to investigate national defense.

Create a special agency with responsibility for an expanded program of basic research.

Pass additional civil-rights legislation authorizing the Government to seek injunctions to prevent violations of civil rights.

But to help the little man the ADA would have us reduce taxes at the same time. Remember the \$20-tax cut, which the gentleman voted for? How consistent is the position of voting for bigger expenditures and for tax cuts simultaneously? Obviously, being consistently for the ADA program is not being consistent. So, who is consistent?

Now when the aims of the ADA are totaled, the question keeps popping up—Wherein do the aims of the ADA differ from the aims of socialism?

Certainly, I recognize the right of the gentleman to believe in the ADA program, but by the same token, he must permit me the right to my viewpoint. Obviously there is a vast difference in viewpoints. Could this difference be at the bottom of the attack? The gentleman has not attacked those who make far greater use of the RECORD to expound a viewpoint more in accord with the ADA's and with his own. Whatever his reason, there is no justification for misrepresentations, surely. Where is the fair play and respect for the other man's right to his viewpoint, when such fallacious attacks are made?

Is it wrong for me to oppose the ADA program in my voting record—by striving for a balanced budget, by attempting to restrain and reduce growing Federal Government? As I reason it, reducing Government size, hence cost, is the only way to get a legitimate, fiscally sound tax cut. Is this an inconsistent goal? Is this uneconomical? Further, the gentleman can hardly condemn my right to believe in and work to get govern-

ment out of business operations and to revise our confiscatory progressive income tax, in an effort to foster and encourage initiative and enterprise. As I see it, it is no longer a case of, to quote the gentleman, "Government works for the benefit of the people" but rather of the people working for the Government, as they all do, from 20 percent to 91 percent of their time, depending on their respective brackets. As I see it, my viewpoint stems from basic American philosophy, achieved through struggle, trial and error on this continent, and in adherence to these principles lies the strength and preservation of this great Nation. These are traditional American ideas before they are Republican, Democrat, or Independent. Adherence to ideas and concepts is, to us all, surely more important than adherence to a tag. These concepts, in which I believe, are most certainly not ADA ideas. Does this irritate the gentleman?

There is another yardstick that measures the gulf between us. I refer to the adherence to the program demanded by organized labor's dictatorial leaders, who are now telling Members of Congress how to legislate in all fields, and pretty well succeeding in getting their way. Here again the two gentlemen are as far apart as possible. A quick reference to the booklet all Members received, entitled "The AFL-CIO Looks at the 85th Congress," is a real eye opener. The legislative demands of this group, all clearly laid out, would add ten to fifteen billions to our budget this year, regardless of national defense, and this program, they firmly state, they will insist the Members consider and adopt. At the same time, the demand is made for tax cuts. Consistent? Hardly. Judging from past Congresses, they will succeed, partially at least, in having their program adopted. Again, I cannot find the difference between these demands and the goals of socialism. With Mr. Reuther behind the labor program, my concern over the success of socialism is even greater, since his socialistic beliefs are quite well known.

Again look at the gulf between us. Based on his voting record, which of labor's programs has the gentleman opposed? Recently, a prominent labor leader passing through Dallas claimed that the Dallas Member was "the worst Congressman up there." To this and to my colleague I ask, "Where now is the independent free collective bargaining beliefs of Sam Gompers, the daddy of American labor, who warned against Government entanglement or anything but 'voluntarism' in the labor movement?" For my part, I believe in preserving the freedom of the workingman, including protection from the dictatorial labor boss, who deducts from the pay check as he sees fit, uses others' money to support political candidates, who hires or fires at will, and, through physical and financial intimidation, succeeds in accomplishing questionable goals, goals which are not always those of the union members. So I believe that a Member of Congress must stand up to these labor

leaders or to any pressure group that would ask for legislation not in the national interest. Again, the gulf between the two Members is easily discernible.

Then there is the Congressional Quarterly's economy box score. The gentleman from California was opposed to economy 81 percent of the time, while the gentleman from Texas was for economy 89 percent of the time, again just the opposite. Is being consistently for spending more of the taxpayers' money a worthy goal?

Now, back to the starting point. The gentleman claims that "a vocal oligarchy prides itself in controlling Dallas County" and that the gentleman from Texas is a part of that high oligarchy. Could be this is a reflection of the gentleman's own situation? It does not apply to the Fifth District of Texas.

A rudimentary appraisal of the Dallas situation will show that I was elected much to the surprise of most, certainly the well-entrenched. It was called a fluke by some. Then 2 years later, opposed by the local district attorney a well-known and well-liked county official, I again won, although national magazines and other prognosticators claimed I would not be reelected. My point is simply this: If ever a Member came to Congress under fortunate circumstances, it was I. I was uncontrolled and uncontrollable, with nothing expected but conscientious performance in the tradition of States rights and local responsibilities; not favoring anybody or any group, just looking after the national interest for this particular Congressional District. So the remarks of the gentleman came with poor grace and, again, great inaccuracy. Whoever provided the advice and the research did the gentleman a great disservice. I cannot believe the gentleman did this alone.

By the way, the oligarchy I represent is 850,000 people—Republicans, Democrats, Independents—200,000 of whom voted, giving me a 21,000 majority. Yes, they are nice, friendly, cordial people, as the gentleman surprisingly described them, and they deserve better treatment than this attack upon them.

Unfortunately, I cannot take credit for all the Federal programs and moneys benefiting Dallas which the gentleman seeks to bestow upon me. They were started before my time. I will admit to a certain frustration. Having been dropped squarely into a hodgepodge of New Deal, Fair Deal, and modern legislation, I am aware of the difficulty of returning to the kind of Government I understand to be described in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. But, believe me, I am a long way from giving up the fight.

As for the people of Dallas, their reactions may be summarized by humorous sidewalk talk following the attack, the gist of which is: The liberals will give ALGER credit for the programs of moneys, and the conservatives will applaud the effort to maintain States rights against Federal encroachment. There it is—an ironic twist of fate, that the charge of

inconsistency, no matter how ridiculous, now may well work for me. Perhaps I should invite the gentleman to speak in my District.

This reminds me of the gracious and sincere offer made to me by an outspoken Democrat Member of this House, whom you all know well. "I'll come down to your district, BRUCE, and speak for you or against you, whichever will help you the most."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, did either the Democratic Senators from Texas or any Member of the House vote against these things that he is complaining about, that the gentleman knows of?

Mr. ALGER. That is an interesting question. I leave it to my colleagues to answer.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would like to have the gentleman's comments as to how they voted on this proposition.

Mr. ALGER. As the gentleman knows, The Texas Senators are quite liberal. I shall not at this time speak for my Texas delegation.

To conclude, it is gratifying to me to tell you of the sincere offer made to me by a gentleman on the other side of the aisle whom I admire; he said to me: "BRUCE, I will come down to your District and talk for you or against you, whichever will help you most."

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield.

Mr. SISK. Let me say to the gentleman from Texas that he refers to a couple of comments I made. Certainly they are not anti-ALGER; and I, particularly at this time, wish to commend the gentleman on a great defense of his area and of his city and of his county. I think that is worthy of any of us who are here representing a district, to defend the district from which we come; and certainly I want to commend him for a very fine statement here to the House on behalf of his people.

I do hope that the gentleman understands that the remarks which I placed in the RECORD were not anti-ALGER; they were not anti-Dallas, or they were not anti-Texas. As I said, because of certain questions that had been asked me with reference to whether Dallas County received any benefits from Federal money, I felt it was well that the record be set straight. As the gentleman has already indicated, I appreciate that I made some three or four corrections in the RECORD after the original figures were submitted. I might say that those corrections were made after the Department which had given the figures originally called up and said:

We are sorry, we are in error; there are some errors.

I have a letter from the Department of Agriculture in particular with reference to that particular area.

So I was most happy to set the record straight in that particular instance.

Mr. ALGER. Does the gentleman feel that he has set the record straight in view of what I just said?

Mr. SISK. Yes; I believe the gentleman did not question the new figures which I indicated here. Is that correct?

Mr. ALGER. I questioned them exceedingly. I do not think the gentleman heard my remarks. Did the gentleman collect these figures or did he have help?

Mr. SISK. I might say to the gentleman if he is compiling statistics in order to make the rather lengthy talk he made here today, is it not the usual procedure for his staff to do some of the work? I might say to the gentleman I personally did not do all the work. In fact, I would like to say that every figure used in this statement came directly from the department affected; so if those figures are in error, then they were given in error by the particular department.

Mr. ALGER. I understood that some of the figures came through colleagues of the gentleman and I could not help but feel that the gentleman had even further help. From whom?

Mr. SISK. I did not get the gentleman's question.

Mr. ALGER. Copies of a statement were circulated in my District. I do not know how many there were. Many were returned to my office. The envelopes were Government, they were stamped and obviously sent from up here. Would the gentleman like to comment on that?

Mr. SISK. I assure the gentleman I did not mail out to his District a single copy of this particular statement. The gentleman mentioned about staying in his District. I have had an invitation to come down to Dallas to speak.

Mr. ALGER. Let me second that invitation, and I hope the gentleman will.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the invitation also on behalf of the gentleman. Actually, I only have one question. The gentleman made a statement which indicated that he felt I had made a rather low attack upon him in his reference to being attacked in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I realize the situation involved in that particular statement. But in view of the fact this statement, outside of modifications which were made to it at the last minute, was prepared, I will say, on the 14th of August for delivery on this floor, I made an attempt to contact the gentleman because I certainly proposed to give him a copy of the statement. But I was unable to locate him. Can the gentleman tell me where he was?

Mr. ALGER. Having been separated from my family and children for a great part of the year, and having a 98-plus percent attendance record, I chose to leave in the few closing days of Congress to be with my children before they returned to school. Obviously the leadership was in no hurry to adjourn and the fall school term was approaching. Does the gentleman take issue with that?

Mr. SISK. I do not take issue with that.

Will the gentleman yield to me for a statement?

Mr. ALGER. I have answered the gentleman's question. He knows where I was and was glad to attack me in my absence. Permit me to yield to these other gentlemen.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to comment on the remarks made by the gentleman from California, who seemed to imply that he himself had not ordered these copies. I am advised that only a Member making the remarks can place an order for the copies. I think the RECORD ought to show that another Member of Congress cannot order copies of some other Member's remarks and send them out. So the order must have been placed by the gentleman from California or else he does not understand the procedures used here in the House.

Mr. ALGER. I can only say that the gentleman from California has said he did not. Is that correct?

Mr. SISK. I said I did not mail out the reprints. I think the RECORD will show exactly what my statement was. I made the statement I did not mail a single copy.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Will the gentleman from California explain to us who paid for the copies? How many did he order? Who paid for them?

Mr. SISK. The gentleman from California has no comment on that particular point.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Could it be construed that the gentleman is taking the fifth amendment in this particular case?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. The gentleman from California very clearly stated that the statements he made in the RECORD last year were not anti-ALGER or anti-Dallas. Well, if they were not that, as they are indicated to be, why did he put them there in the first place? That is one question to which he might favor us with an answer.

No. 2: May I commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] from the Fifth District. He is the lone Republican from that State, and maybe it sticks in the craw of some Democrats. That is perfectly all right. That is political. But let us recognize it as that. But, from the observations we have had of the gentleman's work in Congress, he has been independent, he has been fearless, and he is the kind of Member of Congress we ought to have more of, and I congratulate the gentleman.

Mr. ALGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENTLEY. As I understand the basis for the criticism by the gentleman from California, it is to the effect that the Congressional District represented by the gentleman from Texas participated in all these Federal programs in spite of

the voting position which the gentleman from Texas took; is that correct?

Mr. ALGER. That is my understanding.

Mr. BENTLEY. It seems to me, if that line of reasoning were pursued, the gentleman, for example, if he voted against the extension of selective service, his constituents could be subject to the claim of being in the status of conscientious objectors. Regardless of that, I want to commend the gentleman also on his very able representation since the time he has been here for his city and the Congressional District as a whole. The best answer that can be given to the gentleman from California at this particular moment would be, in the words of the gentleman from Texas, if he would care to inform the House as to his voting majority in the election of 1954 and 1956, if he has those figures available.

Mr. ALGER. Is the gentleman asking the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BENTLEY. Yes.

Mr. ALGER. I had a 3,000 majority out of 53,000 in 1954, which was 53 percent, and in the last election I had 56 percent.

Mr. BENTLEY. I think those figures speak for themselves.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I want to commend the gentleman for taking the floor in this forthright and temperate manner in setting the RECORD straight, and stating facts, and I hope the gentleman from California, when he takes the floor in his 15 minutes, will make these additional corrections of fact. There is plenty of room on the floor of the House for honest argument, and this business of indulging in erroneous information and facts is something that should not be indulged in.

The second point I would like to make—and I hope the gentleman from California will bear this in mind, and I hope others in the House will, too—if there is going to be a personal attack against any Member it should not be done in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I can assure you of this, if the gentleman from Texas were not present here all the gentleman from California had to do was contact any number of Members on this side of the aisle, and they would have seen to it that at least his point of view was represented on the floor of the House, where, if erroneous information was given, it could be corrected at that time. Nothing can undo the damage, if it was damage, of sending out erroneous information into the gentleman's District. Again, I want to commend him for his courage and his moderation in meeting this uncalled-for attack. And, I might say, he turned his other cheek, as it were, by notifying not only the gentleman from California that he was going to take the floor today but also the members of the California and Texas delegations. I understand they were notified.

Mr. ALGER. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. I rise for the purpose of commending the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER]. I know he has the complete sympathy and support of all his colleagues. I want to say that in my terms here in the Congress I know of no individual who has come here who has exercised his duties with greater courage and devotion and who has been more faithful to his task than the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER]. He is a real Member of the Congress.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER], with his statement today, with his voting record, with his fearlessness has, I am sure, convinced all of us here, as well as his constituents and the people of this country that they are well and ably represented in this body. His speech, his action, and his ability have served all of us as an inspiration.

Mr. ALGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Texas on a very fine, courageous and forthright statement and to say that it is illustrative of the type of service the gentleman has given. I would say, as far as I am concerned, that this grieves me rather deeply because I have known the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] and have worked with him and we have quite a bit in common. It seems to me that the gentleman from California, having stated that these figures came from the departments should now produce the letters from these departments giving him the figures which were included in the study printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD originally concerning the record of the gentleman from Texas. It seems to me that if those figures were given by the departments, any of the departments would be perfectly willing to substantiate those figures with letters and they should be made available to the Congress.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution. This information would be of help.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am grieved, and a bit nonplussed. Having served on the same committee with the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] I cannot quite imagine that the statements which were put in the RECORD came from him. They sound more like something that would have come from Mr. Butler or those who financially and otherwise support the radical elements of the

Democratic Party for the accomplishment of purposes which they could not accomplish directly.

Mr. Speaker, I rise not to commend the gentleman for a great job of defense. To me, when a person is right, the best defense is an attack. So I rise to commend him for a great attack, in his usual fashion, not for the purposes of the ADA, but for the purposes of those Democrats, Republicans, and Independents who stand for Americanism.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] did not express the viewpoint of most of us in California. Of course, we are used to Texans claiming everything for themselves that is bigger and better. I notice that the gentleman claims that California gets bigger and better Federal grants, and that is probably the case. But as a Californian I want to say that we feel that in the case of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER], he is the biggest and the best; the biggest and the best statesman, the biggest and the best man with the courage to stand up and vote his convictions. I would like to say to him that we in California are proud of him for standing by his convictions in the manner in which he has done that.

Mr. ALGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I want to leave just this thought. I want the gentleman from California to know that his statement forced my answer to protect the people of my District. Further, I have much more material which I will gladly get into the RECORD to bolster my side of this argument, if the gentleman sees fit to continue his attack against Dallas County. There are other comparative studies of interest. I feel sure he will correct the RECORD. I am, frankly, a little bit disappointed and I am saying it to him personally, that he did not retract some of the figures which are so much in error. Possibly he will do so later.

SUMMIT MEETING PITFALLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCormack). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I have not been known as an advocate of, or apologist for, the foreign policy espoused by Secretary of State Dulles because I have always felt that too much of the foreign policy of our Republican administration was but a continuation of the bankrupt foreign policies of the Truman-Acheson era. However, I personally enthusiastically endorse the course of action being followed by President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles in opposing any present summit meeting with the Russian dictatorship unless, and until, sufficient preliminary talks and agreements are arrived at by lower level discussions so as to insure some bene-

ficial results from such a summit meeting. Otherwise, we will again be the victims and dupes of Communist propaganda.

About a month ago, Prime Minister MacMillan of England urged a nonaggression pact between East and West and he hedged his thought by saying—

But peace cannot be secured just by words * * * we need deeds as well.

This call for a summit conference by MacMillan seems to me to have raised a lot of false hopes in the minds and hearts of the rank and file of citizens. These false hopes were further encouraged when certain Democrats in Congress and in the Democratic Party leadership have let it be known that the time has now arrived to negotiate with the Russian Communists. This same argument has been repeatedly revived by Democrats ever since they first recognized Russia in 1933, in spite of the fact that the Russian Communist leaders have repeatedly broken their solemn pledges and treaties.

But these revived Democrat hopes for a peace agreement, at least in the foreseeable future, are at complete variance with any expectations based on past experience. We must apply the wisdom of mankind, as it was so aptly stated by Benjamin Franklin in his Poor Richard's Almanac in 1743 when he said:

Experience keeps a dear school, yet fools will learn in no other.

These Democrats who choose to ignore the facts of experience ought first to listen to their former standard bearer, Harry Truman, who, only this month, stated:

I have had some experience with the makers of Kremlin policy. I have had reason to have little faith in the promises of Communist leaders.

But we should meet with the Russians only if our friends and allies of NATO are in full agreement with us that the Russians were making a concrete and useful step toward peace and control of arms.

These Democrats who are raising false hopes for peace in the hearts of the people ought to first heed the advice of the former Ambassador to Russia, now the Democrat Governor of New York, who was at most of the conferences between Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin. During the investigation of the Katyn Forest massacre, I was cross-examining Mr. Harriman and asked him:

In the light of your experiences in all of the negotiations with Russia and the agreements she has not kept, especially the political agreements, in your judgment should we keep on making agreements with somebody who does not want to perform?

Mr. Harriman replied:

I do not think any agreements with the Soviet Union are of any value, unless they are based on a position of strength, so that they can be forced to carry them out.

And Mr. Harriman further said:

I think we want to get to the day as rapidly as we can when the Free World is so strong that we can compel the Soviet Union to live up to its obligations.

Here are the thoughts and testimony of the two members of the Democrat Party who have had the most intimate contacts with Russian diplomacy and their advice is "no dice." Many other Democrats could be called upon to verify our sad experience with Russian double-talk and broken agreements. Yet, it still seems that many members of the Democrat Party want our fingers to be burned again in trying to handle Russian promises.

Secretary Dulles recently wrote that the Communists in Korea have violated every provision of the Korean peace agreement "except the one provision that we enforce; namely, that they shall not advance militarily beyond the armistice line." In other words, Dulles proves the thoughts advanced by Averell Harriman that the Russians will only honor agreements which we ourselves can enforce.

To hold out to our own people the forlorn hope that summit talks, without all of the safeguards and provisions laid down by President Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles, might be fruitful for world peace would be asking the people to follow a modern Pled Piper who would bring on our destruction. A new round of summit talks without adequate preparation and safeguards would, in my estimation, add to the already overburdened record of broken promises. Fifty-two major agreements were made between Soviet Russia and the United States between 1933 and the summit meeting in Geneva in 1955. The record shows 50 of the 52 agreements were broken. The only two agreements honored were Russia's coming into the war against Japan and the letting of our planes into West Berlin.

History has proven Japan sought Russia's help as a peace negotiator many months before the official armistice. Russia knew this and did not inform the United States. Just several weeks before the end, Russia entered the war and gained all of China.

Russia permitted our air lift operations to West Berlin because she knew we meant business and were in a position of strength.

Russia, by her use of the veto on 82 different occasions in the Security Council of the United Nations, has effectively, and I think maliciously, stopped the growth of any universal collective-security system. How can any sane person feel that all these Russian tactics will now suddenly change for the better.

President Eisenhower pointed out, in his recent letter to Bulganin, that the two main agreements arrived at in the 1955 Geneva summit conference, which Russia solemnly pledged to carry out, were broken.

Russia did not attempt to settle the German question and the reunification of Germany, and has continued to deny the countries of Eastern Europe the right to choose the form of government they want. Secondly, at Geneva, Russia promised to participate in a high level peace conference and finally boldly wrecked that conference.

Whether the Russian officials sign promises or agreements in 1933 or 1955, the end results are the same—broken agreements. In light of all this experience, why continue to bounce our collective heads against the Soviet brick wall of fickleness?

And I do not mean to limit these observations between the years 1933 to 1955. In 1955, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, under Democrat leadership, reported in a staff study that, for the 38 years the Soviet Union had been in existence "its Government has broken its word to virtually every country to which it ever gave a signed promise. It keeps no international promises at all unless doing so is clearly advantageous to the Soviet Union."

Yet, I can anticipate the thoughts of certain individuals who might want to hold out hope that the Russian Communist philosophy is or will undergo a change. Lenin, the main spawn in this materialistic-atheistic philosophy, said:

As long as capitalism and socialism exist, we cannot live in peace; in the end, one or the other will triumph.

At a Polish Embassy reception on last November 18, Nikita Khrushchev told Western diplomats "we will bury you," thus giving the world proof that the original aims of communistic world socialization and domination remain the same through the years.

On November 21 last year, the Communist Party leaders of the world released a joint communique revealing the identity of views of the party leaders. The joint communique, at one part, declares the basis of the foreign policy of the socialist countries which was "that the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence of the two systems" be the guiding principle to develop world peace and friendship.

Now this certainly sounds like sweet music to the ears of those looking for the faintest glimmers of peace. But when one reads further in this Communist communique, he discovers how the Communists define peaceful coexistence.

The communique tells of world transition to socialism and every effort to "unite a majority of the people, to win state power without civil war and ensure the transfer of the basic means of production to the hands of the people, and decisively rebuffing the opportunist elements incapable of relinquishing the policy of compromise with the capitalists and the landlords, and create the necessary conditions for peaceful realization of the socialist revolution."

But what happens if the Communists do not obtain their ends by peaceful realization? Then the communique boldly and candidly outlines a nonpeaceful or war transition. Here is the exact language:

In the event of the ruling classes resorting to violence against people, the possibility of nonpeaceful transition to socialism should be borne in mind. Leninism teaches, and experience confirms, that the ruling classes never relinquish power voluntarily. In this case the degree of bitterness and the forms of the class struggle will depend not so much on the proletariat as on the resistance

put up by the reactionary circles to the will of the overwhelming majority of the people, on these circles using force at one or another stage of the struggle for socialism.

As much as I personally am devoted to peace, and I know the greatest majority of Americans and people throughout the world fervently want peace, I am firmly convinced that a summit meeting at the present time would only be of propaganda value to the Communist cause. Secretary Dulles and President Eisenhower are to be commended for maintaining their principles and there should be no immediate meeting of the heads of state unless and until there have been preliminary discussions, meetings and agreements between the staffs and the foreign minister levels. This course of action, in my humble opinion, can best protect the American people and the world against our country being used as a propaganda pawn in the Russian Communist game for the destruction of liberty, freedom, and capitalism.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF NEW YORK CITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, press accounts indicate that racial crime and violence is running rampant in the public schools of New York City. It is interesting to note in this connection, also, that practically all organizations which constantly agitate for so-called civil-rights legislation and compulsory school integration have their headquarters in New York City.

While these organizations are constantly lobbying Congress and distributing bales of propaganda in behalf of racial amalgamation, schoolchildren are being stabbed, raped, mugged, and beaten under their doorsteps. The incidence of racial crime and violence in New York City has become so widespread that it appears to be accepted as commonplace. It is a fact of life that I am certain must be of grave concern to the decent and law-abiding citizens of that great city, and one which they must regard as shameful and disgraceful.

Mr. Speaker, in my much maligned and segregated State of Mississippi, racial harmony prevails. Except for routine traffic duties, it has not been necessary, within my memory, for policemen to be assigned to duty at any of our public schools, white or Negro.

By contrast, the press reports that public-school principals in New York City not only request police protection within and outside the school buildings; but, in addition, have requested grand jury investigations of violence occurring

on the school grounds. A grand jury foreman has even suggested publicly that parents keep their children at home and out of school until order is restored and the students can be furnished protection from violence.

Mr. Speaker, very seldom are the American people given the facts through the metropolitan press about racial violence at integrated schools outside the South. However, the tragic suicide of a frustrated Brooklyn junior high school principal earlier this week apparently shocked some of the metropolitan papers into reporting at least a portion of this violence. Even so, the highly touted New York Times, which purports to print "all the news that's fit to print" carefully avoided printing the racial identification of the parties involved when a partially blind 13-year-old white girl was brutally ravished by a 15-year-old Negro youth in the basement of John Marshall Junior High School. Instead of attempting to force school integration in States where experience has proved it impractical, these agitating organizations and newspapers would render a greater service by acknowledging the fact that racial differences among people do exist, and that social intermingling of the races cannot be accomplished by force and against the will of the people.

Mr. Speaker, racial crimes and lawlessness in New York's public schools have created a more serious threat to the peace of that community than was experienced at Little Rock High School.

There is no comparison between Little Rock and Brooklyn, inasmuch as no students have been raped in Little Rock, no students have been stabbed in Little Rock, no students have beaten up teachers, and there are no organized criminal gangs roaming the streets of Little Rock. All of these things are apparently daily occurrences in Brooklyn.

Where are the bleeding heart editorials requesting Presidential action to restore peace and order? Who have heard the protests of eastern politicians, including Messrs. Brownell, Harriman, Wagner. Strangely, these people, who were so vociferous during the Little Rock episode, are now silent as the tomb.

Where are the paratroopers? Why is it that the President has not federalized the New York National Guard? Are our armed services to be used solely against the southern people to make sure that the President's private definition of "peace and order" is achieved? Will the Secretary of the Army and Chief of Staff send orders alerting riot troops in and around New York, or are those orders reserved exclusively for southern schools?

Law and order in New York City has obviously broken down and city officials appear unable to cope with the situation. Why has there not been a demand for Federal action?

Regardless of the tragic situation in Brooklyn, I personally hope that the President will not compound his Little Rock blunder by sending troops to Brooklyn—at least until he has been requested

to do so by the legislature or governor as the Constitution requires.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include several recent newspaper items carrying reports of this violence:

[From the New York Times of January 29, 1958]

HEAD OF SCHOOL BESET BY CRIME LEAPS TO DEATH—BROOKLYN PRINCIPAL HAD BEEN SCHEDULED TO TESTIFY ON VIOLENCE BY STUDENTS

(By Emanuel Perlmutter)

The principal of a Brooklyn public school that has been beset by juvenile crime committed suicide yesterday.

George Goldfarb, 55-year-old head of John Marshall Junior High School, plunged to his death from the roof of the six-story apartment house in which he lived at 201 Eastern Parkway, Brooklyn.

His body was found at 11:50 a. m. in a rear courtyard. He was to have appeared at 10 a. m. for the third time before a special Kings County grand jury that has been investigating violence in Brooklyn schools. Mr. Goldfarb had newspaper clippings in his wallet relating to the inquiry.

TESTIFIED LAST WEEK

Mr. Goldfarb testified before the grand jury last Thursday, 2 days after a 13-year-old girl reported that she had been raped in the basement of the school by a 15-year-old youth. The school is at Park Place and Rochester Avenue in Crown Heights. It is almost equally divided between white and Negro pupils.

At that time, Mr. Goldfarb was reported to have told the jurors that he would like to have a policeman stationed inside his school. A patrolman had been on guard outside at the time of the attack.

There has been a continuing controversy between the grand jury and the board of education over the jurors' demand that policemen be stationed in the city's schools. The board has opposed the assignments.

POLICE RECEIVE LETTER

It was disclosed last night that Mr. Goldfarb, perhaps in the last letter he wrote, had notified the police that he wanted a policeman stationed inside his school. The letter was mailed Monday night and reached the police yesterday morning.

When William Jansen, superintendent of schools, was told about this he said the board of education "would certainly have approved his request."

The suicide occurred as the jurors were meeting to hear County Court Judge Samuel S. Leibowitz read two letters saying that violence existed at Public School 67 and a probation report that indicated an assistant principal had sought a new assignment because of teen-age gang threats.

When notified of Mr. Goldfarb's death, A. George Golden, foreman of the grand jury, said the jurors would call in board of education officials to learn whether the principal had been under pressure or had been threatened with disciplinary action by his superiors because of his testimony.

Mr. Golden said the jurors felt "much concerned" and "very sorry" over Mr. Goldfarb's death.

Charles H. Silver, president of the board of education, issued the following statement:

"This is a tragic situation which, we are sure, saddens everyone. There is no doubt that the recent unfortunate events, plus the subsequent pressures on him as a result of these events, contributed in a great measure to Mr. Goldfarb's decision.

"We see here that tragedy can breed more tragedy through hastily conceived action, regardless of how worth while the motives,

In behalf of the entire board of education, I express our deep sympathy to the bereaved family."

The rape reported on Tuesday that resulted in Mr. Goldfarb's appearance before the grand jury was followed on Thursday by two other incidents involving violence. Patrolman Thomas Fleming, on duty outside the school, was punched by 1 of 6 youths he ordered not to loiter around the building. Later, the school's recreation director was assaulted by a youth in the basement of the school.

[From the New York Times of January 29, 1958]

JUNIOR HIGH BESET BY RECENT CRIME—SCHOOL HEADED BY PRINCIPAL IN SUICIDE HAD NOT BEEN CONSIDERED DIFFICULT

(By Leonard Buder)

Time and again, George Goldfarb, principal of John Marshall Junior High School in Brooklyn, who committed suicide yesterday, would admonish his pupils to steer clear of trouble.

"If you mind your business," he would say, "nothing will happen."

But in the last 8 days Mr. Goldfarb found that no matter how he tried he could not keep trouble away from his school. A flurry of incidents turned the school, in the public eye, into a blackboard jungle—a symbol of rampant violence in the schools.

Up until the first incident—the reported rape of a 13-year-old girl—John Marshall Junior High School was just another one of the city's more than 800 public schools. In fact, it was considered to be better off than many other junior high schools.

Situated in the ethnically changing Crown Heights section, at Park Place and Rochester Avenue, the school is not classified as difficult according to the board-of-education standards. Almost one-third of all junior high schools and one-quarter of the elementary schools are officially considered to be difficult.

SCHOOL HAS 1,200 PUPILS

John Marshall, which also carries the numerical designation of Junior High School 210, has 1,200 pupils enrolled in grades 7 through 9. Its pupils are mostly 13 to 15 years old. Educators generally consider this age group to be the most difficult of all.

The family backgrounds of the students cover a wide social and economic range. However, there is an unmistakable downward trend. In recent years many of the neighborhood's once-fashionable homes have been converted into multiple dwellings to house the influx of low-income residents.

The school's student body reflects the community—45 percent is Negro, 10 percent is Puerto Rican, and the rest is mainly white. The school has always taken pride in its integrated enrollment. This term the president of the student government is a Chinese-American, the vice president is of Polish extraction, the secretary is Jewish, and the treasurer is Negro. The school's active parents' association has a white president and a Negro vice president.

Unlike many other city schools, John Marshall has no problem of overcrowding and no double or triple sessions. It presents a full academic program, including instruction in three foreign languages. Its classes for intellectually gifted children attract pupils from other schools in the area. Twenty-five student clubs attest the interest the youngsters and teachers have in extracurricular affairs.

BUILDING BEING RENOVATED

From the physical standpoint, the school is regarded as being in pretty good shape for a building that is more than 30 years old. It is now being renovated and repainted.

But the school has its troubles, too, and they were apparent even before last week's incidents. A small, tough element of student troublemakers has been causing concern for some years, according to one school official.

In addition, as is true in many other schools in difficult areas, the school has suffered from occasional invasions by troublemakers from the general community. The assaults last Thursday on a patrolman and a recreational leader at the school were by teen-age boys who were not pupils there.

"All in all," a school spokesman said yesterday, "Mr. Goldfarb felt that he was bringing the problem under control. He seemed to be on top of the situation."

Yesterday, however, Mr. Goldfarb leaped six floors to his death.

[From the New York Times of January 29, 1958]

TWO HIGH-SCHOOL GIRLS STABBED IN BROOKLYN—FIVE BOYS SEIZED IN ATTACK AT SUBWAY STOP

Two teen-age girls were stabbed in the back yesterday as they were changing trains at Franklin Avenue and Fulton Street, Brooklyn. The girls were on their way home after examinations at Bishop McDonnell Memorial High School.

They were taken to Kings County Hospital, where their wounds were described as not serious. Both were discharged 7 hours later.

Within minutes after the stabbing, a policeman who had seen a disturbance at the corner seized 5 youths, 14 to 16 years old.

The police believed that the youths had been drinking wine. Last night a search was under way for the person who had given it to them.

Yesterday was a between-sessions day at the Roman Catholic school for girls at Classon Avenue and Eastern Parkway. According to Rev. William J. Cavanaugh, principal, the students took tests and were measured for uniforms. When the girls were finished, they were dismissed.

A group of girls boarded the Franklin Avenue elevated shuttle near the school, as they usually did. The line ends at Franklin Avenue and Fulton Street, where the girls transfer to the IND Lefferts Avenue line.

The police reported that as the girls reached the street, they were accosted by the youths, who demanded money. The girls ignored them and started for the subway steps. Two believed they had been punched in the lower back. At the change booth, they discovered they had been stabbed.

The girls are Katherine Guilfoyle, 17 years old, of 160 Hendrix Street, Brooklyn, and Sharon Gallagher, 15, 87-35 115th Street, Richmond Hill, Queens. They were taken to the hospital. The other girls in the group were not hurt.

Meanwhile, Patrolman Carlton Irish, of the Brooklyn Juvenile Aid Bureau, saw the commotion. The policemen of the Grand Avenue precinct had been instructed to give special attention to the corner because of previous incidents.

Patrolman Irish saw five youths walking away and halted them as they sought to get away. Among the five the police found two knives longer than a penknife and a razor blade.

One boy was identified by a victim as her attacker, and other girls said all five boys were in the group.

[From the Washington Daily News of January 29, 1958]

NEW YORK SCHOOL VIOLENCE RIDDEN—PRINCIPAL KILLS HIMSELF

NEW YORK, January 29.—A grand jury investigating violence in schools prepared to-

day to question board of education officials about pressure on a principal who committed suicide shortly before he was to have testified a third time about juvenile crime in his school.

The principal, George Goldfarb, 55, of John Marshall Junior High School in Brooklyn, jumped from his apartment house roof yesterday. He had been scheduled to appear a few hours later at his own request before a Kings County grand jury that has been looking into lawlessness in Brooklyn public schools.

Mr. Goldfarb's school has been the scene of a rape and 3 assaults in the last 8 weeks. A member of the school system 33 years and John Marshall principal since 1954, he was reported greatly disturbed by publicity resulting from the grand-jury investigation.

IN THE MIDDLE

He also was caught in the middle of a controversy between the grand jury and the New York Board of Education over proposals to assign policemen to violence-ridden schools. The grand jury three times has handed up presentments calling for such action. The school board has called the proposal unthinkable.

But some relaxation of the board's stand was indicated yesterday with disclosure that Superintendent of Schools William Jansen is notifying all principals that they may have a policeman stationed inside their schools if they request one. It is up to each principal, Mr. Jansen said.

Jury Foreman A. George Golden said the jury would call in higher ups of the board of education to ask whether the principal had been under pressure or had been threatened with disciplinary action for aiding the grand jury. He said Mr. Goldfarb had been exceedingly cooperative.

The principal, whose school has 1,214 pupils of whom 45 percent are colored and 10 percent Puerto Rican, told the grand jury he would like to have a policeman stationed in his school and requested one in a letter received Monday by police.

Mr. Goldfarb's suicide focused attention on teen-age violence that has included these incidents:

VIOLENCE

Five colored youths who police said were pretty high after drinking wine stabbed two high school girls on their way home in a Brooklyn subway station yesterday. The girls were hospitalized but not seriously injured.

A 13-year-old girl, partly blind and unable to identify her attacker, was raped in the basement of John Marshall Junior High last week.

At the same school, 1 of 6 boys loitering outside attacked a policeman when he told them to move on; 2 teen-agers beat an after-school recreation leader; and 2 boys attacked a third with a shovel handle and a knife.

Police charged two teen-agers with murdering a 21-year-old gang member.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 30, 1958]

SCHOOL OFFICIALS BLAME SUICIDE ON THREAT BY JUROR—"A LIE," SAYS JURY CHIEF IN RETORT—WAGNER AWAITES DATA ON CRIME
(By Judith Crist)

Charles S. Silver, president of the board of education, said yesterday that a grand juror's threat of possible indictment had probably caused George Goldfarb, principal of a Brooklyn junior high school, to commit suicide Tuesday.

The charge, supported by Superintendent of Schools William Jansen, who said he knew of at least one other case of schoolmen being threatened by the jurors, brought a heated

denial from A. George Golden, foreman of the jury which is investigating crime in the schools.

Mr. Golden described Mr. Silver's remark as follows:

"A lie, made up out of his own mind to befuddle the public."

Mr. Golden accused school officials of answering every jury action with deliberate lies.

Mr. Silver refused further comment.

Dr. Jansen said succinctly: "I have not lied," as the long-brewing warfare between the board and the jury burst into vituperation. Mayor Wagner reiterated his confidence in the way the board of education and the police department have been handling crime in the city schools and said he expected a full report on the situation today from Deputy Mayor John J. Theobald.

Yesterday the mayor conferred briefly and generally with Dr. Jansen by telephone. Mr. Theobald, superintendent-elect to succeed Dr. Jansen on July 1, conferred with the superintendent at board headquarters, 110 Livingston Street, Brooklyn, for 45 minutes in the afternoon. He said they talked about general problems and the immediate situation, but declined to elaborate on the latter phrase.

Mr. Silver made his charge of grand-jury threats yesterday afternoon at the funeral for George Goldfarb, 55, principal of John Marshall Junior High School, Brooklyn, who plunged to his death from the roof of his home Tuesday morning when he was to have made his third appearance before the Kings County grand jury.

At the junior high, Public School 210, a student was raped on a stairway on January 21 and 2 days later after school hours 3 teenagers, none a student, were arrested, 1 for assaulting a policeman in the schoolyard and 2 for attacking a recreation leader in the school basement. Mr. Goldfarb had appeared before the grand jury on January 21 and last Thursday and was recalled on Tuesday.

The board of education and the jury have been at loggerheads over the jury's demand that a patrolman be stationed in every troubled school. The board has established a policy, supported and implemented by the police department, of having the principal determine whether he needed a patrolman stationed in or outside the school. Yesterday a patrolman was posted inside Public School 210, as Mr. Goldfarb had requested on the day before his death.

Arriving at the Riverside Chapel, at Ocean Parkway and Park Circle, for the principal's funeral yesterday, Mr. Silver said to reporters, referring to Mr. Goldfarb's appearance before the jury and the board of education last Thursday:

"Several hours before he appeared before the grand jury, he came before the board of education. In discussing with us his grand jury interrogation, he said that a juror warned him that he might be and could be indicted. This probably caused him to take his life. He was very worried."

Dr. Jansen, who stood next to Mr. Silver, nodded his agreement. After the service, which was attended by about 500 school officials, teachers, students, friends, and relatives, Dr. Jansen was asked whether he knew of any other witnesses who had been threatened with indictment. He replied:

"I think there are some others, but I'm not sure. One other I know. I'll let you know in a day or two."

Informed of these comments, the jury foreman, Mr. Golden, a real-estate dealer, said:

"At no time since we were impaneled on November 6 has anyone been threatened in that grand-jury room with indictment or anything else. We have treated every official with respect and courtesy. We are not deal-

ing with hoodlums and roughnecks, but with highly respected educators. We are trying to help the board of education. We are not trying to indict them."

"Mr. Silver's remark was a lie, made up out of his own mind to befuddle the public. In every one of our actions, they have answered with deliberate lies and remarks cast against our grand jury. It is a cry of 'witchhunt' reminiscent of former Mayor O'Dwyer."

He referred to former Mayor William O'Dwyer's characterization of a grand jury investigation of the Harry Gross bookmaking empire which involved many members of the police force.

Although officials declined to specify what threats of indictment schoolmen could face, it was noted that they could possibly be indicted for perjury. Or, as County Judge Samuel S. Leibowitz told the jury at its request, it could indict any school official who failed to take preventive measures before a crime was committed in a school and thereby willfully causes or permits the life of a child under 16 to be endangered.

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES IN DALLAS COUNTY, TEX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. Sisk] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to make just a few brief comments here in an attempt to clear the Record.

I wish to state in the very beginning to the gentleman from Texas, and may I say that I appreciate very much his remaining for these comments, that I stand ready and will be most happy to make any corrections which he can substantiate that show that my statement was in error. I make that statement publicly and I want to assure the gentleman that will be done. As I indicated before, the departments were contacted. Each of these figures were requested. They were furnished by the departments. If they are in error and the department can furnish corrected figures, I certainly will be the first to submit them. As the gentleman indicated, I have made some four corrections already, but no department has called to my attention that there are other errors in the Record. As I have indicated, however, the gentleman from California will make any needed corrections at the proper time because I have no intention of giving any incorrect data.

One further matter to which some rather great import seemed to be attached was made by some of my friends on the Republican side of the aisle, and it had to do with certain reprints or certain copies that were mailed. I want to ask the gentleman from Texas if there were reprints made?

Mr. ALGER. I believe that the word is "copies" and I must say to the gentleman I know nothing about the mechanics of this. We just received the returned mail because there was no return address on the Congressional envelopes from the House of Representatives that were sent out stamped.

Mr. SISK. In all fairness to the gentleman from Texas, I want to be sure that we understand each other. One of his colleagues, I think, made quite a to-

do about certain reprints about which I know nothing. I want to know if a statement had been made that reprints had been made, and if so, I would challenge the statement that any reprints of this copy were made by the printer.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me, since I raised that question?

Mr. SISK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. It does not make too much difference to me what you call them, whether you call them copies or reprints. Would it help the gentleman any if I phrased the question: Who paid for the copies that were mailed? Would that help any or would the answer of the gentleman still be "No comment"?

Mr. SISK. Apparently, the gentleman is under the impression that there were some reprints made. I challenge the statement that reprints were made. Further, I will state to the gentleman I will be very happy to answer his question. The gentleman from California paid for no copies and paid for no reprints of this particular statement. Does that answer the gentleman?

Mr. CEDERBERG. No; it does not answer the question at all. Who did pay for them?

Mr. SISK. I have no idea. I have informed the gentleman that I did not order any reprints. I did not order any copies and I did not pay for any.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I was just wondering what California was doing in Texas politics.

Mr. SISK. I have no idea who mailed them out, I might say to the gentleman. Now I would like to set the record straight. I understand, of course, that some considerable to-do was made about voting averages, or percentages, in the last campaign or the campaign before that. I do not know how important that is here and I am certainly not here to blow my own horn. I admit that my first term here, I squeaked in by a very narrow margin. I think it was by about 53 percent of the votes. If it has any bearing on the type of job that we may be doing for our districts, I came back to the Congress in 1956 with 74 percent of the votes and with about a 70,000 vote majority. I am not here to crow about it or to brag about the situation, but apparently somebody in my district felt I was doing a fair job. I would like to discuss and make a few comments concerning the reference that was made to the ADA and to the position of certain labor organizations. I understand that I have a 100 percent rating with the ADA.

Mr. ALGER. I have the 3-year record here, I will say to the gentleman in case he would like to inspect it. You are 100 percent with them.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman. I do not deny it, but I personally was just not aware that they had come up with a recent record giving me a 100 percent rating. All I can say with reference to that is that apparently their position on major

legislation is pretty much in line with what the people across the country, and particularly in my district, are interested in. I do not take any orders from ADA. I have not received any direct communications from them. I do not happen to be a member of it, but if my vote happens to agree with them, that is fine with me, and I have no apology to make.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. Yes, I yield. The gentleman yielded to me.

Mr. ALGER. The gentleman speaks for his district certainly, and I would not criticize his right to his viewpoint, but the majority of the people in Dallas County elected the gentleman from Texas, and I do not think you speak for a majority of the country. I have the record here and I will give it to you. I have it for 3 years, the only years I have been here. I was not keeping this for the gentleman from California but only for my own information until the gentleman attacked me.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the gentleman's statement and I regret his statement that I attacked him. I would like to say that, irrespective of what interpretation he and others place upon it, if they interpret that as an attack that is up to them. I do not interpret that as an attack upon the gentleman from Texas, but in line with what I have been reading month after month in the RECORD, and the gentleman's own statements of his position on these issues, and as I stated a little while ago, people coming to me and saying, "Is it a fact that there are areas in the country that refuse to accept Federal assistance at all?" One particular question related to Dallas and Dallas County. I have a great deal of respect for that area. This is a bit off the subject, but I happened to go to school in an area very close to Dallas, more years ago than I would like to admit. We had boys come over to the dormitory from Dallas, and they were pretty nice fellows. We called them Big D in those days, because those boys had the biggest letter of any kind I had ever seen on a sweater. They were proud of Dallas. We were proud of the boys, because some of them were pretty good football players and we were happy to welcome them. So I am not trying to cast any reflection upon the people in the gentleman's district, but to call attention to the fact that they are apparently standing at the Federal trough all the way up to their ears and taking their share of all these programs. As a result, I decided it might be interesting to determine the amount of Federal aid Dallas County was receiving.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. SISK. I yield.

Mr. ALGER. Does the gentleman remember one of the remarks I made, in which I flatly contradicted the Lovett vote for \$26½ million? The gentleman should know this was a bond-issue affair and was not Federal money. How long do you think my newsletter was put in the RECORD, which you read so many times?

Mr. SISK. I do not recall, but I read it off and on for some time and it is interesting because it has a particular viewpoint.

Mr. ALGER. Let me say to the gentleman that the chamber of commerce and the people of Dallas and myself thank him for the assiduous attempt that he has accorded our district.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

The gentleman called attention to a correction which I put in the RECORD some weeks after the original statement, in which he indicated that I said that the corrections were of very little import, when actually the corrections specifically were of substantial quantities. I was referring to the fact that the corrections were very small percentagewise compared to the total, because the total figures which I had originally indicated in my statement amounted to \$902 million, plus, of Federal moneys going into Dallas. After all the corrections which I have had called to my attention had been included, there was still a total of \$885 million going into Dallas County.

I think in a way the gentleman is to be commended for apparently the amount of money he is able to get down there; and I might say that I was privileged, by the way, to get some excerpts from some of the Dallas papers after this was put in the RECORD. Some are very interesting, and there was a surprising amount of mail, by the way, that I received from Dallas. I will say not all in favor, but I will say not all unfavorable to him.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I do not know how much time I have left, but I yield.

Mr. CEDERBERG. The gentleman is aware of the fact that there are some members of the Texas delegation other than the gentleman from Dallas, who happens to be a Republican. I happen to admire them a great deal because of the fact there are some I admire very much, such as the gentleman from Dallas. I wonder if the gentleman is considering inserting any other information regarding those Congressional districts, or is he fighting Dallas because Dallas is represented by a Republican?

Mr. SISK. I will say to the gentleman that at the present time I have not made up my mind on that.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? He indicated that he would yield to me.

Mr. SISK. Yes; I did promise the gentleman I would yield to him, and I do so at this time.

Mr. LAIRD. I wonder if the gentleman would care to comment on the procedure that is used, and I think it is a procedure to which many of us object, the procedure of obtaining unanimous consent in the well of the House to extend remarks and then putting in the RECORD statements derogatory of another Member whether that Member happens to be a Republican or a Democrat, whether he happens to be on my side of the aisle or the gentleman's side of the aisle.

I think a serious question of propriety is involved in the matter of inserting remarks of this nature under unanimous consent, and I hope that out of today's discussion will come some understanding that this kind of procedure will not be used again, particularly when the Member in question is not on the floor to object to the consent request, and particularly when the gentleman inserting the remarks does not advise anyone that derogatory statements are going to be made about another Member of this body in that extension.

Mr. SISK. If the gentleman will yield to me for a moment—I do not want to be discourteous to him and cut him off, but my time is slipping away and I want to comment on what the gentleman says.

This is my fourth year in this body and I believe I have not been promiscuous in derogatory statements about Members either on my side of the aisle or the gentleman's side of the aisle; and, as indicated earlier, I am happy to apologize and do now apologize for anything he may consider derogatory, to the distinguished gentleman from Dallas. As I explained earlier, I have no personal feeling against him. I admire him in the way he has stood up for his county and his great city of Dallas. I have differences with him politically; and I do have differences with him in his philosophy.

I might say to my friend from Wisconsin that in his argument I disagree on the standpoint of philosophy, but in no sense because I impugn his integrity, or his honesty, or his sincerity. I would be most happy, as I have already indicated, to publicly apologize, as I am already doing, if that can be inferred from the remarks the gentleman put in the RECORD and which we are now discussing here.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCormack). The Chair would suggest that any Member desiring to ask a question first address the Chair to ascertain if the gentleman will yield.

Does the gentleman from California yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from California this question. I would be much concerned if by inference any damage was done to the gentleman from California or any other Member of this House. Since the subject has come up with regard to this being circulated in the district of the gentleman from Texas in Congressional envelopes, not by frank but by stamp—the gentleman says he did not order the reprints or copies, and I presume not the envelopes—does not the gentleman think that to clear up and remove any improper inferences it would be well for the House to understand how those copies were made, who ordered them, and who sent them out?

Mr. SISK. I do not know to what extent the House wishes to do so. I believe

the gentleman will agree with me, that I have stated, and I stand on this, I know nothing about any reprints, any copies, any mailings of that type into the gentleman's district in Texas. I reiterate, and it will stay in the Record in my remarks, if that happened I have no knowledge of it. As far as I am concerned I have no responsibility.

In conclusion and summary, Mr. Speaker, I would like to reiterate that on the basis of figures supplied by the Federal departments responsible, the people of the county of Dallas in recent years have received and are enjoying Federal aids, grants, and benefits amounting to \$885 million—approaching a billion dollars, under programs with which I heartily agree, and with which it appears the gentleman from Texas representing Dallas County disagrees.

Now I am glad the people of Dallas County are enjoying these benefits and I think they have a right to receive them and enjoy them. I think the final determination of this debate is up to the people of Dallas County. They are the ones who are going to have to decide whether or not they agree with the need for these programs, in which they do not hesitate to participate, or whether they agree with the gentleman from Texas representing that area. So far as I am concerned, I think the record has been set straight and they will be in a position to make an informed decision, period. I have no desire to belabor this issue further, but I assure the gentleman there is nothing I enjoy more than a good debate of political philosophies if that is what he wants. I made a factual statement concerning the large extent to which Dallas County is participating in Federal programs and I pointed out this is inconsistent with the repeatedly expressed views of the gentleman, and upon that statement I stand.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCormack). The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR—ONE OF THE WORLD'S BEST NEWSPAPERS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, this year every well-informed person is congratulating the Christian Science Monitor on its 50th anniversary.

Wherever newspapermen who take pride in their craft gather to compare notes, they speak of the Monitor with respect and admiration.

For here is one of the truly great newspapers in the world, noted for its accurate reportage of national and international events and for the fair and balanced content of its editorials.

It is a model for students of journalism and is the daily reference for all people who must depend on reliable and

objective coverage of world news as the basis for sound opinion and right decision.

Step by step, since 1908, the Christian Science Monitor has built its reputation by unwavering dedication to the truth.

The home of the Monitor is Boston, Mass. Here, nourished by the principles of the First Church of Christ, Scientist, and the intellectual climate of New England, it developed those standards of honest, accurate, and clear journalism that have won for it such universal esteem.

The Monitor never sacrificed quality to gain mass circulation. You will not find "cheese cake," gossip, or lurid tales in its columns. But you will find the national and global news for mature and responsible people based on factual reporting that you can trust.

For the Monitor expects and receives from its first-rate correspondents around the world the dispatches and the interpretations covering significant events that have firmly established its reputation as an international daily newspaper. I suspect that even the Kremlin is secretly, though grudgingly, impressed by its character.

As we face up to the responsibilities of the space age, it is apparent that we will have to change some of our attitudes of recent years and recover the standards and real values that have been lost in the concentration on material progress.

The Christian Science Monitor has never surrendered its standards to the temptations of the sensational headline or the slanted story.

By devotion to the highest principles of journalism it has earned its position among the world's great newspapers.

We congratulate the Christian Science Monitor on its 50th anniversary. And we are confident that 50 years from now its superb integrity will have won for it top honors as the international daily newspaper.

TAX RELIEF

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOLTZMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing in the House of Representatives a bill which will provide some measure of tax relief for the thousands of small-business men in this country. Campaign bills have been introduced by other Members of the House, and are pending before the House Committee on Ways and Means.

During recent years, we here in the United States have been experiencing a vigorous economic expansion, but the high interest rates and tight-money policy have had a damaging effect on small-business men and have left them in a financially weak position. Inflation is a persistent problem and the rising

cost of living has been felt by growing numbers of American businesses.

Over the years there has been much talk and discussion about the problems of small business. In the past campaigns the political parties—both Democratic and Republican—pledged assistance to small businesses through adjustment of taxes. And approximately 2 years ago President Eisenhower appointed a Cabinet Committee on Small Business, which was to investigate the financial and economic condition of small business and make recommendations that would aid these business structures. This committee, in August 1956, made four specific recommendations:

First. That the taxes imposed on business corporations be modified by reducing the tax rate from 30 to 20 percent on incomes up to \$25,000.

Second. That businesses be given the right to utilize, for purchases of used property not exceeding \$50,000 in any 1 year, the formulas of accelerated depreciation that were made available to purchasers of new property by the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Third. That corporations with 10 or fewer stockholders be given the option of being taxed as if they were partnerships.

Fourth. That the taxpayer be given the option of paying the estate tax over a period of up to 10 years in cases where the estate consists largely of investments in closely held business concerns.

The bill I am introducing carries all four of those recommendations, and in addition carries another provision which states that in the case of any person engaged in a trade or business, there shall be allowed as a deduction for the taxable year an amount equal to the additional investment in the amount of \$5,000 or 20 percent of the net income of such trade or business for the taxable year—computed without regard to this section—whichever is the greater, provided, however, that the total amount of any such deduction shall not exceed \$30,000 for any taxable year.

To maintain a healthy economy all segments of that economy must flourish, and it is vitally important that we give those in the small business structure every opportunity to build up the necessary reserves to tide them over during any recession period. The small-business man is the hard core of the free enterprise system, here in the United States and abroad, and is a basic safeguard against monopoly and concentration of economic power. On my recent trip to Europe the fact was brought home to me most clearly that a country that does not have the small-business man as the backbone of its free enterprise system cannot have a strong or stable economy. The Nation cannot afford to ignore the desperate plight of these small firms which require immediate and meaningful assistance in the field of tax reduction. Every day we hear of some small firm which has been forced to close its doors. In New York and here in Washington firms which have been in business for many, many

years are going out of business because they can no longer face the uncertainty of the future and the impact of high business taxes. In the Law Journal we read of many more petitions in bankruptcy, and the situation is growing worse.

Just yesterday the House passed a resolution to give an additional sum of \$200,000 to the Select Committee on Small Business to study the problems of small business. This committee has done a tremendous job in pointing up the critical situation facing small firms today, and its assistance to small business in the past has been invaluable. As a result of its reports and recommendations in the past, we know some of the problems of small business, and we now need to put into operation a definite plan of action to assist the independent businessman. We must take prompt action to revitalize this smaller segment of our economy, and this bill is a step in that direction.

I respectfully urge my colleagues in the House to give this grave problem very serious consideration, and to enact legislation which will bring about the much needed relief.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BAILEY, for 30 minutes, on Monday next.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SISK, for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MACHROWICZ and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. SULLIVAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PERKINS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. NATCHER.

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CRETTELLA and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WITHROW and to include a telegram.

Mr. ALLEN of California and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois.

Mr. COLLIER (at the request of Mr. CHAMBERLAIN).

Mr. HALE.

Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. BOLAND and to include an address by Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK.

Mr. WINSTEAD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALBERT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire.

CIV.—88

Mr. GATHINGS and to include a table.
Mr. HERBERT and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 728. An act to authorize the acquisition of certain property in square 724 in the District of Columbia for the purpose of extension of the site of the additional office building for the United States Senate or for the purpose of addition to the United States Capitol grounds; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution providing additional funds for the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 8216. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to prevent unjust enrichment by precluding refunds of alcohol and tobacco taxes to persons who have not borne the ultimate burden of the tax.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House on the following titles:

H. R. 5938. An act to amend section 812 (e) (1) (D) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 with respect to certain decedents who were adjudged incompetent before April 2, 1948;

H. R. 7762. An act to amend section 223 of the Revenue Act of 1950 so that it will apply to taxable years ending in 1954 to which the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 applies;

H. R. 8865. An act relating to the administration of certain collected taxes; and

H. R. 9035. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the basis of stock acquired by the exercise of restricted stock options after the death of the employee.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 3, 1958, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from

the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1539. A letter from the budget officer, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting a copy of Standard Form 143 for the period ending December 31, 1957, for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, pursuant to the Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A-34, dated July 25, 1957; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1540. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting reports on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract procurement awards to small and large business firms for work in the United States during the first 5 months of fiscal year 1958, pursuant to Public Law 268, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1541. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a copy of a report on a review of the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles, Calif., 1956, Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, pursuant to the Housing Act of 1954, approved August 2, 1954 (42 U. S. C. 1435); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1542. A letter from the administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the annual report on the administration of functions under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1543. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to amend section 4083, title 18, United States Code, relating to penitentiary imprisonment"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1544. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report by the United States General Accounting Office on its positions and their incumbents in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1545. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9371. A bill to provide for the relief of certain members and former members of the Army and the Air Force, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1311). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 426. Resolution authorizing funds for the operation of the Committee on Un-American Activities; without amendment (Rept. No. 1312). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 459. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 8290, a bill to authorize the erection of a national monument symbolizing the ideals of democracy in the

fulfillment of the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1029), "An act to create a National Monument Commission, and for other purposes"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1313). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 460. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2151, a bill to amend certain provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 relative to import duties on certain coarse wool; without amendment (Rept. No. 1314). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 461. Resolution for consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 39, joint resolution to authorize the construction of certain water-conservation projects to provide for a more adequate supply of water for irrigation purposes in the Pecos River Basin, N. Mex., and Tex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1315). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 462. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 4215, a bill amending sections 22 and 24 of the Organic Act of Guam; without amendment (Rept. No. 1316). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 463. Resolution for consideration of House Joint Resolution 2, joint resolution to provide for transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project and payment to Crow Indian Tribe in connection therewith, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1317). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 464. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 1244, a bill to provide for the development by the Secretary of the Interior of Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1318). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 465. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 912, a bill to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine; without amendment (Rept. No. 1319). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8439. A bill to cancel certain bonds posted pursuant to the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, or the Immigration and Nationality Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 1320). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 652. An act for the relief of the Thomas Cruse Mining & Development Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1305). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1714. An act for the relief of Roma H. Sellers; with amendment (Rept. No. 1306). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7057. A bill for the relief of Henry Bigajer and Maria Bigajer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1307). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8134. A bill for the relief of certain

employees of the Department of the Air Force, Mobile Air Materiel Area; with amendment (Rept. No. 1308). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9396. A bill for the relief of C. J. Pobojeski; without amendment (Rept. No. 1309). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9878. A bill for the relief of Dora Thelma Andree; without amendment (Rept. No. 1310). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 10368. A bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 10369. A bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 10370. A bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H. R. 10371. A bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa:

H. R. 10372. A bill to amend section 13 of the Federal Highway Act to permit the Secretary of Commerce to reimburse the States for the United States pro rata share of the value of materials stockpiled in the vicinity of Federal-aid highway projects for use in the construction or reconstruction work involved in such projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 10373. A bill to extend the time for filing certain claims for refund of income tax which are based on the sick pay exclusion of section 22 (b) (5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H. R. 10374. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to authorize appropriations for forest highways for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H. R. 10375. A bill to amend the act terminating Federal supervision over the Klamath Indian Tribe by providing in the alternative for private or Federal acquisition of the part of the tribal forest that must be sold, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 10376. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H. R. 10377. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the donation of surplus property to volunteer fire-fighting organizations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 10378. A bill to limit the applicability of the antitrust laws so as to exempt certain aspects of designated professional team sports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 10379. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to provide that no security in the form of a bond or otherwise shall be required of deposits to the extent that they are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:

H. R. 10380. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to provide for paying an indemnity of \$10,000 to the widow, children, or parents of any member of a uniformed service dying after 1956 under circumstances not permitting payment of dependency and indemnity compensation or death compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 10381. A bill to strengthen the national defense, the cause of peace, and assure the intellectual preeminence of the United States, especially in science and technology, through programs designed to stimulate the development and to increase the number of students in science, engineering, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other disciplines, and to provide additional facilities for the teaching thereof; to promote the development of technical skills essential to the national defense; to assist teachers to increase their knowledge and improve their effectiveness; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 10382. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, to provide for the increased use of rice by the Armed Forces and in certain federally operated hospitals; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. GRANAHAH:

H. R. 10383. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the minimum benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H. R. 10384. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 10385. A bill to revise the basic compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 10386. A bill to prohibit and make unlawful the charging of a fee to view telecasts, or to enjoy the use of television in private homes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 10387. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 10388. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to reduce the rates of percentage depletion for oil and gas wells; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 10389. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to assist small and independent business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KNUTSON:

H. R. 10390. A bill to extend and expand the special milk for children program for an additional 2-year period, to extend the program of expanded milk in Veterans' Administration facilities and Armed Forces for an additional 2-year period, and to extend

the brucellosis eradication program for an additional 2-year period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 10391. A bill to amend section 312 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to exempt certain additional persons from the requirements as to understanding the English language before their naturalization as citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 10392. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the broadcasting of subscription television programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H. R. 10393. A bill to establish a program of survival food depots in order to provide subsistence for the large numbers of the civilian population of the United States who would be evacuated from the devastated areas in the event of attack on the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 10394. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the provisions which presently restrict the deduction for medical expenses to those exceeding 3 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 10395. A bill to increase from \$600 to \$700 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 10396. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to provide that the first \$50 per month of earned income may be disregarded by the State agency in determining an individual's need for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 10397. A bill to authorize emergency refinancing loans to farmers in disaster areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 10398. A bill to provide for approval under title X of the Social Security Act of State plans for aid to the blind without regard to the existence in any State of other plans of assistance to blind persons financed entirely by the State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 10399. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, so as to prohibit the granting of authority to broadcast subscription television programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 10400. A bill to create a Small Business Capital Bank System to make available to small business a source of equity and long-term loan capital where such capital is not available on reasonable terms from existing private sources; to transfer to such system all funds which are presently available under section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act for loans to industrial and commercial firms, together with certain other funds out of the surplus accounts of the Federal Reserve banks; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H. R. 10401. A bill to create a Small Business Capital Bank System to make available to small business a source of equity and long-term loan capital where such capital is not available on reasonable terms from existing private sources; to transfer to such system all funds which are presently available under section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act for loans to industrial and commercial firms,

together with certain other funds out of the surplus accounts of the Federal Reserve banks; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 10402. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 10403. A bill to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 10404. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for the protection of the public health, by prohibiting new food additives which have not been adequately pretested to establish their safe use under the conditions of their intended use; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H. R. 10405. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the former naval industrial facilities at Center Line, Mich., to the State of Michigan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 10406. A bill to amend title XV of the Social Security Act to provide for payments of unemployment compensation thereunder to veterans discharged after 1958, to the same extent as such payments are made to civilian employees of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COAD:

H. R. 10407. A bill to amend section 13 of the Federal Highway Act to permit the Secretary of Commerce to reimburse the States for the United States pro rata share of the value of materials stockpiled in the vicinity of Federal-aid highway projects for use in the construction or reconstruction work involved in such projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 10408. A bill to include as creditable service for purposes of retirement under section 6 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act certain service of individuals transferred under Executive Order 9067 of February 20, 1942; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 10409. A bill to provide minimum price support levels for whole milk and butterfat during the 2-year period beginning April 1, 1958; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 10410. A bill to establish a Public Lands Management Study Commission, to establish a policy of multiple use of the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H. R. 10411. A bill to prohibit discrimination because of age in the hiring and employment of persons by Government contractors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 10412. A bill to cancel reimbursable charges against Mission Indian lands in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. Con. Res. 247. Concurrent resolution to extend greetings of the United States to the Government and people of Israel on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the independence of Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OEDERBERG:

H. Con. Res. 248. Concurrent resolution to request the President to designate the year

1960 as "Visit U. S. A. Year"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 249. Concurrent resolution to request the President to designate the year 1960 as "Visit U. S. A. Year," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. Con. Res. 250. Concurrent resolution to request the President to designate the year 1960 as "Visit U. S. A. Year"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. Con. Res. 251. Concurrent resolution to extend greetings of the United States to the Government and people of Israel on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the independence of Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. Con. Res. 252. Concurrent resolution to request the President to designate the year 1960 as "Visit U. S. A. Year"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. Con. Res. 253. Concurrent resolution to request the President to designate the year 1960 as "Visit U. S. A. Year"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. Con. Res. 254. Concurrent resolution to request the President to designate the year 1960 as "Visit U. S. A. Year"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. Con. Res. 255. Concurrent resolution to extend greetings of the United States to the Government and people of Israel on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the independence of Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. J. Res. 518. Joint resolution designating October 31 of each year as Youth Honor Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. J. Res. 519. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Army to make a survey of a water route from Albany, N. Y., into Lake Champlain, N. Y., and Vt., with ultimate connection with the St. Lawrence River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HASKELL:

H. J. Res. 520. Joint resolution to designate the 1st day of May of each year as Loyalty Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. J. Res. 521. Joint resolution providing for the construction by the Department of the Interior of a full-scale demonstration plant for the production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. Res. 466. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct an investigation and study of certain problems arising from population migrations within the United States and between the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. Res. 467. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of the fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND: Memorial of the Rhode Island General Assembly, urging the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of State of

the United States, and the Tariff Commission to enact and maintain tariff rates on textile imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. R. 10413. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cecellia Cellino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 10414. A bill for the relief of certain claimants against the United States who suffered personal injuries, property damage, or other loss as a result of the explosion of a

munitions truck between Smithfield and Selma, N. C., on March 7, 1942; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRANAHAH:

H. R. 10415. A bill for the relief of Hurwitz, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 10416. A bill for the relief of J. Henry Ennen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 10417. A bill for the relief of G. Elmer Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 10418. A bill for the relief of Mabel L. Mathis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 10419. A bill for the relief of North Counties Hydro-Electric Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

871. By Mr. KING: Petition of Mrs. Della Painter, Inglewood, Calif., and 80 constituents of the 17th Congressional District of California urging support to remove the advertising of alcoholic beverages from our homes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

372. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Iron County Clerk, Hurley, Wis., petitioning consideration of a resolution adopted by the Iron County Board of Supervisors on January 14, 1958, requesting the Federal Government to place a tariff on all iron ore, steel, copper, plywood, and pulpwood imported from foreign soil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Post Office Ban on Obscene Magazines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMMET F. BYRNE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 30, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate permission to say a few words about the recent decision of the Supreme Court in nullifying the ban by the post office on mailing three obscene magazines.

I quote from the January 24 issue of the New World, a reputable news journal:

The Supreme Court decisions, which have the effect of sharply restricting the legal definition of obscenity—particularly with regard to nudist publications—were delivered without written opinions.

This action is in itself interesting since the New World mentions further "that the Court merely filed a notice that it was granting review of the constitutional issues raised in the cases and simultaneously filed a per curiam decision that the lower courts were reversed." The Court added cryptically, "See Roth against United States" in each case.

As I understand this Roth against United States decision reached by the Supreme Court June 24, 1957, the Court upheld in a 6 to 3 decision the constitutionality of the Federal law banning obscene material from the mails. In the majority opinion, Justice William J. Brennan, Jr., laid down a new definition of obscenity that is having increasing impact on Federal and local law enforcement of anti-smut laws. Quoting from Justice Brennan, he states "the test of obscenity should be whether to the average person, applying contemporary community standards, the dominant theme of the material taken as a whole appeals to prurient interest." It appears the Court did not believe the magazines violated this standard.

As the father of eight children, I am and always have been concerned with

what my children read. Though I am aware of the efforts to change our moral codes in many instances, I do not believe we need to change our definition of the word obscene as found in Webster's dictionary.

My District in Chicago has a great number of devoted teachers who are nuns, priests and laymen. They are gravely concerned with the moral education of their pupils as well as the academic side. My belief is that permitting obscene magazines to go through the mails is not contributing to the good of any of our young people who read them, nor does it make it any easier for our schools in their efforts to teach reason and decency; to explain the difference between good and bad. If such leniency is permitted by the Government, then I do not believe the Government is serving the best interests of the people in America.

A Soul-Searching Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 30, 1958

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, last week I cast a vote in this House which was both preceded and followed by much soul searching on my part. I refer to the action of Thursday in voting to increase the public debt limit by \$5 billion.

The action we took that day was a needful one; but it was a shameful commentary on our Nation's immediate past. We had to vote the debt limit increase solely because we have a balance of a billion dollars, and bills that already total more than that. Obviously if we had not voted the increase our Government would have had to default its bills in a step toward the destruction of our national credit. Chaos undoubtedly would have followed.

I had a rather positive feeling then, as I have now, that this action should not have been necessary. Those who voted against it had some very sound reasons or principle for doing so.

First of all, I would have been more than naive had I placed full faith on the assurance contained in the measure that this was only a temporary debt limit increase. We all know how the word "temporary" has changed in meaning in recent generations. There are temporary buildings built some 40 years ago which threaten to outlast us all. There were temporary programs enacted during the depression years which are still on the books and still actively in use. "Temporary" has become a meaningless word and there is nothing to indicate that this temporary debt limit increase will not be with us for a long time to come.

Then there is the reasonable argument that this measure would not have been necessary had other Members of the House followed the voting procedure as I did last year when I voted against more than \$10 billion in appropriations or authorizations.

But unfortunately the majority of the Members of Congress did not have that kind of economy voting record. For too many years in the past our Legislature has not had that kind of a voting record. And the result came Thursday when we had to vote for the debt increase or face grave dangers of financial chaos.

I voted for that measure with great reluctance. Under similar circumstances, I shall not do so again in the future.

After 45?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 30, 1958

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, how much longer are men and women going

to find it difficult to find work after 45—in the most prosperous country in the world? All have the same story, "Nobody wants to hire you after you are 45." We send millions of dollars to Indochina and countries all over the world, to keep them from suffering, while here in our own country, we have people suffering from hunger, illness, loneliness, and the crushed spirit of people unwanted and dispossessed. The skills and talents of these people brought America through wars and developments. They are not asking for jobs that pay \$100 per week, but simply asking for a chance to work, live, and exist as a decent citizen. Our Government spends millions to salvage corn, to save butter and eggs, yet are we over 45 surplus people? Our services and experiences, though they may be limited, should receive part of the attention given to surplus food. Before year 1958 these people have to become 65 before they are eligible for social-security pensions, and after 65, many are not eligible, if they have not the required number of quarter years worked where social security deductions were made. There is a period of 20 long years from 45 to 65. The majority of these people have raised families and found it impossible to save enough money to live without work from 45 to 65—a period of 20 years. Our lawmakers have passed a law whereby there should be no discrimination regarding age on employment, but it has failed to eliminate this condition. How much longer will our country, that prides itself on fighting prejudice and segregation of color, continue to cultivate prejudice against employment after 45? We, the people of America, believe that our clergymen, Roman Catholics, Protestants, Jewish, and all who profess to be Christian should follow the example of God in behalf of these unfortunate people over 45 with the lawmakers of our country, to uphold the Constitution of the United States for all men and women so that they may work and live as decent citizens after 45.

Legislative Poll of the Second New Hampshire Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PERKINS BASS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 30, 1958

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following 1958 legislative poll of the Second New Hampshire Congressional District:

QUESTIONNAIRE

For the fourth year, I am taking a poll of the people in New Hampshire to learn your feelings on important issues before the Congress. Your opinions on these issues will be of great value and interest to me. Please check the answer which best corresponds

with your own thinking and return to me at the above address, together with any additional comments you may have on the back

of this sheet. The wording of each question is not intended to influence your answer one way or the other.

	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you favor the following major legislative recommendations which the President has just made to Congress?			
a. Extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act?			
b. Continuance of the mutual security program of military and economic aid to friendly nations?			
c. Liberalizing the immigration laws?			
d. A 5-year \$82,000,000 Federal aid to education program, providing limited student scholarships, teaching fellowships, and matching grants to States to bolster the Nation's educational system, particularly in science and mathematics?			
e. Sharing atomic secrets with our allies?			
f. Statehood for Alaska and Hawaii?			
2. Do you favor a multibillion dollar nationwide atomic shelter program?			
3. Do you favor increasing social-security benefits with a corresponding increase in individual and employer contributions?			
4. Assuming greatly increased military expenditures are necessary for the security of this country, do you favor a balanced budget at all costs?			
5. Do you favor a summit conference between the President and Soviet leaders on current East-West differences?			
6. Do you oppose inviting to this country the heads of Communist nations for conferences?			
7. President Eisenhower has recommended to Congress a 6 percent cost-of-living pay increase for Federal postal and civil service workers (cost \$1,043,000,000). Check 1 answer only.			
a. I favor this pay increase.	<input type="checkbox"/>		
b. I am for a lesser pay increase.	<input type="checkbox"/>		
c. I don't think this pay increase is enough.	<input type="checkbox"/>		
d. I am opposed to any such pay increase at this time.	<input type="checkbox"/>		
e. No opinion.	<input type="checkbox"/>		
8. Do you think the Federal Government should exercise additional control over labor union finances and activities?			
9. In general, do you approve of the way in which President Eisenhower is doing his job?			

Although this is of course optional, it would be helpful to me if you would indicate your correct name and address below. If I have the wrong address or have sent you more than one questionnaire, please draw a circle around your correct address below.

Sincerely yours,

Member of Congress.

Name _____
Street _____
Town or City _____

A Salute to Hartford, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 30, 1958

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, on February 3, 1958, a formal ceremony will be held in Hartford, Ky., commemorating the 150th anniversary of the approval of the legislative act incorporating that city as a municipality. It is quite proper that we pause and give due recognition to this noteworthy event.

Ohio County is located in the central part of the Second Congressional District of Kentucky which I have the honor to represent. It covers an area of 596 miles, and, as of the 1950 census, its population was 20,840. Rich agricultural lands are located in Ohio County. Also coal and oil deposits are present. In 1798 the county of Ohio was formed. It was carved from an area of Hardin County, Ky. On February 3, 1808, Hartford, the county seat of Ohio County, became a town. Its name was probably derived from the ford on Rough Creek—now known as Rough River—where wild

animals, particularly deer, were in the habit of crossing. Hartford was the third town in western Kentucky to be chartered.

During the War of 1812, Ohio County formed three companies of men to carry arms. One accompanied Gen. Samuel Hopkins up the Wabash River, another went with Gov. Isaac Shelby, while the third company was under Gen. Andrew Jackson at the Battle of New Orleans. Up to the present time the citizens of Ohio County have manifested their patriotism, bravery, and love of country in every conflict the United States has been engaged in.

In this crucial period now facing us, it is not amiss to review the history of the States comprising our great Nation, as well as the municipalities which are a part thereof. Just as we will probably be called upon to exert initiative and make sacrifices, so were the early settlers of Ohio County. They, too, faced challenges which were not met by negotiations, but by forceful action. These men and women summoned their God-given strength to respond to the challenges of their time. Often the experience of our forebears can give us warning of what to do and what not to do. If we are to create enduring peace, we must seek its origins in human experience and in the record of human idealism. We may have forgotten to pass on the lesson that the men and women who founded Ohio County and the city of Hartford knew so well; that freedom is our most valuable possession, and must be jealously protected and strengthened by each generation.

We can imagine that the pioneers in Ohio County and Hartford must have looked around with satisfaction at the visible evidences of their prospering in a new land—the snug dwellings, the fields from which the tillage had been taken, and the churches where they thanked

God for His bounty. The beginning they made so long ago has become the heritage of their descendants who have carried on with the results we see today—a prosperous, industrious, and happy generation of outstanding citizens. I salute them one and all.

The Dairy Farmers of America Are in Real Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 30, 1958

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks to include therein a telegram from Charles Dineen, executive secretary, Wisconsin Independent Milk Producers Association.

The dilemma of the American farmer is tragic today. The State Department trades or negotiates him out of a foreign market for his products. Selfish business interests frequently precludes giving the products away here in the United States. The Secretary of Agriculture decries production instead of battling the State Department or some segments of business as is his duty. Wisconsin dairy producers need some expert assistance, but more than that—Wisconsin needs a real dairy program of national scope. In line with the request of Mr. Charles Dineen, executive secretary, I submit the following telegram for the RECORD:

HON. GARDNER WITHROW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The Wisconsin Independent Milk Producers Association, representing most of milksheds supplying Milwaukee and Chicago, worried over dairy situation and market outlook for producers, request your undivided effort toward satisfactory dairy program and suggest it is high time United States follows lead of other countries, notably Dominican Republic, in fostering sound dairy industry based upon strong Holstein Friesian bloodlines and broad use of dairy products. The Dominican Republic has solved agricultural problems and worth your study and attention. Looking forward your making these views known to Congress through CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and pertinent remarks of your own.

CHARLES DINEEN,
Executive Secretary.

I telephoned the Dominican Republic Embassy and learned theirs is a specialized dairy production and distribution. Free milk and cheese and milk products are actually gotten to the children and others who may be in need. They not only produce, but they market that production on an orderly plan. I suspect that is what Mr. Dineen refers to. Rather than be a mere storage reservoir, our Department of Agriculture might well become the rounded marketing outlet which the Government of the Dominican Republic has assumed. The growing unemployment in the United States suggests a reasonable outlet for

our milk and cheese. Let us not simply tell the Wisconsin dairyman "No." Let us get busy.

Education—The Ultimate Weapon To Win Strength for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 30, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include my statement before the House Committee on Education and Labor, in support of H. R. 8571, a bill to provide Federal insurance for loans made to science and engineering students for tuition.

The statement follows:

EDUCATION—THE ULTIMATE WEAPON TO WIN STRENGTH FOR PEACE

Mr. Chairman, since I introduced a bill to provide Federal insurance for loans made to science and engineering students for tuition on July 8, 1957, fast-moving developments have shattered our complacency.

What seemed advisable then, has become imperative now. The Russian success in opening up the age of space has shocked us out of our lackadaisical attitude toward education. We have come to realize that the trained capacity to think is not merely a sideline, but the very essence of our way of life.

To design and produce intercontinental missiles, to explore space, and in everything required to win peace and progress, education is the key.

The New York Times of October 27, 1957, quotes the Educational Testing Service as reporting that lack of money keeps many of the best high-school students from college. Some 150,000 high ability students would have gone to college had adequate financial support been offered them.

Benjamin Fine, of the Times has this to say, "To help the qualified students enter, many colleges offer scholarships and student loans." Even though scholarships have jumped 100 percent in the last 5 years, still not enough is done to meet the tremendous demand for help. The hunger for scholarships was highlighted last Tuesday when 300,000 high school seniors took part in the merit scholarship examination. This is probably the most intensive talent hunt in our Nation's history. The exams are sponsored by the National Merit Scholarship program, set up 2 years ago with a \$20 million grant from the Ford Foundation. Since then, business and industry have added several million dollars.

The results of the Tuesday tests will not be known until early spring. Of the 300,000 who took the difficult exams, 7,500 will enter the semifinals of the merit program. The final winners will split about \$4 million among them. Only 800 of the 300,000 who sought help through scholarships will actually get any kind of financial assistance. What happens to the other 299,200 eager candidates?

"This waste must stop," one educator insisted. "We can't afford the luxury of keeping our best brains out of college."

Even the cautious recommendations of the President on this subject will fail to eliminate this waste.

Soviet Russia is training scientists and engineers at a rate that will leave us far behind, unless we exert ourselves to the utmost. Incidentally, in that Communist society, they do loan money to bright students, to open the doors of educational opportunity for them.

While we cling to the old formulas of financing the higher education of promising students; the formulas that are inadequate to meet the demands of the space age.

What incentives do we offer?

To digress for a moment, I would like to point out that the highest salaries in the United States are paid to business executives and movie stars, while in Russia the highest salary is paid to the president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences.

The more I think of the critical challenge confronting us, the more I am convinced that our survival depends upon a bold and generous program to make our educational system the best in the world.

The bill I have introduced, to provide Federal insurance for loans made to science and engineering students for tuition, is a modest step in that direction. I realize that much, much more must be done to make up the deficit of our longstanding neglect of education. But it is a beginning.

For the purpose of facilitating loans for tuition to science and engineering students in institutions of higher education, lenders shall be insured by the United States against losses on loans made by them to such students after January 1, 1958, if made upon the conditions and within the limits specified in this act. The total principal amount of new loans to students covered by insurance under this act in any fiscal year shall not exceed \$25 million.

From this beginning I hope that other and far more expansive programs will develop so that American education becomes the ultimate weapon that wins strength for peace.

Surplus Stocks of Commodity Credit Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 30, 1958

Mr. GATHINGS. Today I have introduced a bill which seeks to make available surplus stocks of Commodity Credit Corporation rice to certain departments of the Government.

The purpose of this legislation is to encourage the increased use of rice by our Armed Forces and various other Federal institutions by permitting them, when they have used their usual quantities of this wholesome food to so certify to the Commodity Credit Corporation and to receive such additional supplies of rice as they can use in that particular year.

The bill would not interfere with the normal consumption of rice by the Armed Forces or these other Federal institutions nor would it interfere with the normal channels of trade. But it would be an incentive for these institutions to make greater use of rice and provide added nourishment to its personnel.

The domestic consumption of rice is estimated to be about 27.5 million hundredweight. This domestic consumption has been more or less stationary and we

now have about 10 million hundredweight of rice held in CCC stocks. The purpose of this bill is to reduce those stocks and to acquaint more of our citizens with the delicious and nutritious grain that is the basic diet for more than two-thirds of the world. It would result in reduced storage costs to the Government, increased meal-units for our Armed Forces and Federal institutions at very

little added cost, and it will spread the acceptance of rice in a manner that should increase the domestic consumption of rice to a point that this grain will no longer be listed as a surplus commodity.

Such a program, if effective, can assist in preventing a further drastic curtailment in rice acreages that have plagued our rice farmers and our agricultural

communities for the past several years. The bill would extend the milk program policy to include rice, another surplus agricultural commodity and encourage its expanded consumption. The bill should be enacted.

I would like to attach a table with respect to the supply and disposition of rice under certain assumptions.

The table follows:

Rice—Determination of normal supply and national acreage allotment for the 1959 crop using varying levels of assumed exports

[In thousand hundredweight]

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
NORMAL SUPPLY										
1. Estimated domestic consumption, 1958-59.....	27,450	27,450	27,450	27,450	27,450	27,450	27,450	27,450	27,450	27,450
2. Assumed exports, 1959-60.....	16,000	18,000	20,000	22,000	24,000	26,000	28,000	30,000	32,000	34,000
3. Sum of items 1 and 2.....	43,450	45,450	47,450	49,450	51,450	53,450	55,450	57,450	59,450	61,450
4. Allowance for carryover 10 percent of item 3.....	4,345	4,545	4,745	4,945	5,145	5,345	5,545	5,745	5,945	6,145
5. Normal supply (item 3 plus item 4).....	47,795	49,995	52,195	54,395	56,595	58,795	60,995	63,195	65,395	67,595
NATIONAL ACREAGE ALLOTMENT										
6. Estimated carryover, Aug. 1, 1959 ¹	17,000	17,000	17,000	17,000	17,000	17,000	17,000	17,000	17,000	17,000
7. Indicated production needed in 1959 (item 6 minus item 6).....	30,795	32,995	35,195	37,395	39,595	41,795	43,995	46,195	48,395	50,595
8. Estimated average yield per planted acre 1954-58 (pounds).....	2,963	2,963	2,963	2,963	2,963	2,963	2,963	2,963	2,963	2,963
9. Indicated national acreage allotment for 1959 (item 7 plus item 8).....	1,039,318	1,113,567	1,187,816	1,262,065	1,336,315	1,410,564	1,484,813	1,559,062	1,633,311	1,707,560
10. 1958 national acreage allotment.....	1,652,596	1,652,596	1,652,596	1,652,596	1,652,596	1,652,596	1,652,596	1,652,596	1,652,596	1,652,596
11. Percent reduction in indicated 1959 allotment from 1958 allotment.....	37.1	32.6	28.1	23.6	19.1	14.6	10.2	5.7	1.2	+3.3

¹ Based on the assumption that exports during the 1958-59 marketing year will be only 16 million hundredweights.

America in Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 30, 1958

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, on January 17, 1958, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] delivered a significant address to the Commonwealth Club of California, in San Francisco. I know that the Senate will be as interested, as I was, in the proposals suggested by the Senator from New York on a wide range of important topics. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator's remarks be incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA IN CRISIS

(Text of an address by Senator JACOB K. JAVITS delivered before the Commonwealth Club of California, Sheraton Palace Hotel, San Francisco, Calif., Friday, January 17, 1958, 1 p. m., P. s. t.)

The mood of the Congress may be described as being deeply mortified that the United States, considering its leadership and power, is in a position where it must catch up with the Soviet Union in the missiles race at the price of our very survival.

I believe the majority of the Congress, by that osmosis which in a free society transmits to us the deepest hopes and fears and aspirations of the people, feels a real sense of urgency and crisis. We do not think we have too much time to catch up, and we do not think that catching up is enough. Most of us feel that a great country like ours should be infinitely more powerful in its mission for peace and freedom than the

Russians in their mission for communism and totalitarianism.

In his state of the Union message, the President with characteristic unpartisanship has sensed the mood of the country for specifics, for a program of action which will give each of us a task on which we can begin. The question now is whether the Congress and the people will implement it—indeed by the determination of their response to the President's call assure that the whole executive department, too, will follow through on the President's program. The people will not, I believe, want anyone continued in high office not engaged with spirit and conviction in carrying out the agreed program.

There are new dangers, imminent and real, which we now face that require new remedies. Although the Soviet Union's missile lead is the most dramatic and prominent, this mortal danger is compounded by the dangers of recession in the United States and by resistance to free world ideals among the so-called neutralist countries because leading European powers identified with them are also identified with yesterday's colonialism and imperialism.

The President has already led the way for those of us in the National Government to outline a program of action which, being specific may then be subjected to that analysis and debate which has so often produced our greatest national efforts. Although the time is short and we are all under pressure, the need for using our resources, both human and material, effectively requires not a piecemeal approach but a total program. If enough of us are willing to make our proposals promptly and in specific terms, then our course will be most quickly charted. That any program suggested will include matters already proposed is, of course, clear. Indeed it is hoped that in this way the greatest consensus of view may be arrived at the most promptly.

The people are prepared, I believe, to work as hard as required and to direct materials and energies into the program imposed upon us by the leadership responsi-

bility for peace as we would in war. For it is becoming increasingly clear that the Russians are making a deadly serious bid to take world leadership we are devoting to peace away from us and use it for their own purposes of imposing communism on the world; and that they believe they now have a chance to do this by military superiority, propaganda, infiltration, and subversion without world war III.

As specifics, I urge the following steps in addition to those recommended in the President's message:

1. Expand the National Security Council to include four public members to be appointed by the President with the approval of the Senate to make it a truly broadly based National Board of Strategy.

2. Reorganize the operational control of the Armed Forces substantially as recommended by the recent Rockefeller report with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff designated as principal military adviser under the Secretary of Defense and the President, general officers becoming free of any service designation and the individual armed services concentrating on logistics, training, and administration.

3. Place the policy and operational authority and responsibility to coordinate the scientific efforts in defense in the hands of Dr. James Killian, the President's scientific adviser.

4. Provide standby controls on materials, manpower, and credit to be invoked if needed by the President with the advice of the reconstituted National Security Council, subject to a Congressional veto.

5. As a basis, though not necessarily a precondition for a summit meeting, insist on freedom of information on both sides of the Iron Curtain. As we are willing to have the pronouncements of Soviet leaders making their foreign policy case available for consideration by our public, we should insist that the policy statements of our President and leaders be made as widely and freely available for consideration by the people of the Soviet Union.

6. Forge closer links by greater partnership with our allies and with the regional organizations for defense and economic cooperation to which we adhere; and strengthen our efforts to give greater means and authority to deal with the problem of colonialism and to preserve the peace to the United Nations.

7. Materially expand our international trade, foreign economic aid (including surplus food disposal program) and technical assistance activities to win the cold war for peace—and bring the private sector of the United States economy fully into all phases of the effort. Emphasize the antirecession aspect of this effort.

8. Through civil defense, immigration, and civil-rights action and by encouragement of the arts demonstrate the deeper implications to the national spirit of the challenge we face.

Now to a point-by-point explanation of my suggestions:

Point I. Expand the Security Council: the Congress and the country feel a sense of urgency in catching up and staying abreast of the Soviet Union in our defense capability.

The strategic concept of defense as it relates to our foreign policy must be clear. This was the reason for the creation of the National Security Council, established by the National Security Act of 1947, whose purpose was to assess and appraise the objectives, commitments, and risks of the United States in relation to its actual and potential military power in the interests of national security for the purpose of making recommendations to the President.

The activities of this Council were to be supported by a number of agencies in peacetime but primarily by the Central Intelligence Agency created at the same time by the same law. Events surrounding the unreleased Gaither report indicate a great dissatisfaction with the amount of public participation and public knowledge of the operations of the NSC. Accordingly its membership should be expanded by the addition of four public members which might very well constitute bipartisan representation, appointed by the President with the approval of the Senate. Also, the Council should be required to render annual reports to the President and to the Congress and to the extent that the national security does not absolutely require secrecy its reports should be published. This was the original recommendation of the Eberstadt report made to Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal on October 27, 1945, by Ferdinand Eberstadt, of New York. The report stated that "thus the public would be kept posted on these vital matters by an authoritative and dependable source." In this way, the Council could be a National Board of Higher Strategy and could aid in building up public support for clear-cut, consistent, and effective foreign and military policies. One of the lessons to be learned from the Russian earth satellites is that the defense of our country requires total effort by all our people—not just by Government; and that the public must be made aware of and share in great national decisions which are required.

Point II. Reorganizing the operational control of the Armed Forces: Strengthening our chain of command to keep the Defense Establishment at maximum efficiency and effectiveness and maintain civilian control is a cardinal point. We can no longer afford the luxury of interservice rivalry, whatever may have been its previous benefits. There must be a direct chain of command and clear-cut lines of responsibility from the Secretary of Defense down. This, I believe, would be accomplished by instituting substantially the changes as recommended by the Rockefeller report.

Point III. Coordinating the scientific effort for defense: We may not have the time now to fractionalize the defense scientific effort by putting together a Manhattan project and

taking it away from the various services now engaged in it. But we can see that one authority determines priorities and coordination among the defense scientific activities of all departments of the Federal Government, the National Science Foundation, the laboratories in colleges and universities, the voluntary organizations, and American business.

Point IV. Stand-by controls: We should now provide stand-by controls on materials, manpower, and credit to be invoked at the direction of the President with the advice of the reconstituted National Security Council, subject to the right of Congressional veto for 30 days before going into effect, according to practice followed in Government reorganization plans. This is essential to place us in the right posture for the major national effort we are undertaking and to thereby tie in and coordinate with this major national effort the policies of United States business and United States labor. For it is very clear that these predominant elements of the private economy need to participate in United States foreign policy through their own policies, for they represent by far the greatest part of our country's production and economic strength. The establishment of stand-by controls subject to the safeguards I suggest will give to the Government a basis for consultation and planning with United States business and United States labor in the present emergency; it will also serve notice that we mean business in the acceleration of our defense and foreign aid and trade efforts.

Point V. Freedom of information between East and West as a condition to top level negotiations between the heads of state of the United States and the Soviet Union. There must be an end to radio jamming. We can hardly look forward to great progress from summit meetings as long as our aims and aspirations are blacked out to the people behind the Iron Curtain. The arguments and points of view on both sides need to be exposed to the peoples of each side, specifically to establish a frame of reference for greater progress on the major points of tension. As the President stated in his answer to Premier Bulganin on January 13, "It is, above all, important that our peoples should learn the true facts about each other. An informed public opinion in both our countries is essential to the proper understanding of our discussions." The President's proposal in this letter for outlawing space missiles is a historic free-world bid to end the mortally dangerous weaponry race.

Therefore I believe we should place high on the agenda of the preparatory foreign ministers meeting proposed by President Eisenhower, a United States proposal to allot equal time on American and Russian radio, television and in newspapers for the accurate exchange of each other's stated government policies and political opinions. Right now, it's a one-way street. Last year, millions of us saw and heard Khrushchev on American television and radio. At that time, Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON called for reciprocity. For years, commercial television and radio networks in this country have broadcast filmed, taped, and live on the scene coverage of world leaders in action, particularly Russian delegates, at the United Nations. Our newspapers, radio, and television newscasts regularly quote Russian leaders and Communist Party statements. It is time for the Russians to give equal time and I believe the neutralist nations of the world should vigorously support such an equal-time proposal by the United States.

Our State Department's negotiations with the Soviet Government—now said to have been agreed in principle—to increase the interchange of persons, nonpolitical, and to initiate the exchange of broadcasts, also nonpolitical, aim at increasing mutual understanding. But only by obtaining equivalent

newspaper space and airtime in Russia for the fair reporting of American political thought and policies, including interviews with our leaders, can we ever hope to impress the millions living under communism, who are daily exposed only to their government's propaganda, with the true content and sincerity of the free world's disarmament plans and peace proposals. Then we would have at least a chance at building substantial public opinion behind the Iron Curtain which would encourage fruitful disarmament conferences at the summit level.

I have few illusions that we can change the Soviet censorship on statements by our governmental leaders through appeals directed to the Russian leaders. They have little to gain and a great deal to lose by letting the peoples of the Soviet Union know on the most authoritative level how far we really and sincerely desire to go to achieve a lasting peace. I believe we can, however, force a realization of this censorship by putting the Russian leaders on trial before the people of the world if they continue to refuse to grant freedom of exchange of information.

We should launch a campaign through our delegation to the U. N., the State Department, the USIA, and our diplomatic establishment to enlist the nations of the world behind the principle of such a free exchange of information. Let us start our equal-time formula with a 30-minute program featuring Khrushchev or Bulganin on the subject of a summit conference to be broadcast in the United States in return for 30 minutes of a generally equivalent Eisenhower broadcast with no strings attached in the U. S. S. R.

Point VI. Partnership lies with our allies: Our people now realize as never before the extent to which our national interest is engaged with the national interest of our allies. Particularly, we need overseas bases for our own and their security. Our allies need to be assured of prior political consultation with us on major foreign policy moves to avoid such flurries as that caused by the recent shipment by us and Great Britain of a minuscule amount of arms to Tunisia.

We need to develop a consistent policy with reference to areas still under colonial administration. It should be heavily based on the British example of phased withdrawal, as in granting independence to India, Pakistan, and Burma; on the possibilities inherent in U. N. trusteeships, as in Libya and Somaliland; and on our own and U. N. facilities for mediation, as they were used in Palestine, Iran, Indonesia, and Suez. We need to lend ourselves to the strengthening of international law by adhering to the world court statute, in which we have not yet concurred; by adopting the U. N. Convention on Genocide, still pending in the Senate; and by joining in the codification of international business law to prevent discrimination against foreigners, particularly in respect to foreign private investment.

Point VII. Expansion of our economic offensive in the cold war: Recent reports on the massive Soviet drive to compete with us in our chosen fields of foreign economic and technical assistance have awakened us to the fact that even our offensive weapons in the cold war are being threatened. As long as 1 billion people in the free world of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East live on a standard less than one-fourth that of the people of Western Europe and one-eighth of our own, we can never rest, never be satisfied or feel truly secure.

Certainly the President's recommendations for increasing the foreign economic development fund by \$625 million and the authorization for Export-Import Bank loans by \$2 billion should be enacted. In addition, we need to be sure we have done enough to deal specifically in terms of economic aid with such issues as the crisis in the industrial development of India under its 5-year plan and of France under the pressure of

its serious commitments. Considering our mounting surpluses of farm products we have only begun to sense the possibilities of this form of aid to industrially underdeveloped countries seeking a quicker means to balance their agriculture with industry without undergoing the privations and terror endured in Soviet Russia and Communist China under such circumstances. In the field of technical assistance, we should enter into partnerships for operations in particular areas with groupings of the NATO countries and the local countries affected, creating little Marshall plans. A case in point is the proposal of Foreign Minister Pella of Italy to establish a Middle East Development Fund from Marshall plan loan repayments due in 1958 plus added contributions from the European debtor countries and others. We should also expand materially our use of technical personnel from NATO countries in foreign technical assistance activities, and expand our training opportunities for nationals of underdeveloped countries in the NATO countries.

In the field of trade, the reciprocal trade agreements program should be extended for 5 years as the President requested and we should join the Organization for Trade Cooperation. We need to get away from import quotas and other types of protectionism and emphasize Federal help to reconvert marginally economic industries without material national security features adversely affected by imports. But we have a great opportunity also to meet the Soviet economic offensive by enlisting the private sector of our economy much more fully than now in the foreign policy effort of the United States. We should continue to expand our rate of overseas private investment from the 1956 level of close to \$3 billion a year to a total of \$5 billion per year in 5 years.

To do this, we should give prompt consideration to an income-tax program for the accelerated amortization of investments made in coordination with the foreign-policy efforts of the United States and for applying on that test the 14 percentage point reduction in corporate income tax we now allow Western Hemisphere investment, to the world. We should consider establishing a governmental medium for integrating the private sector of the American economy into the Nation's foreign policy. The anti-recession aspects of these actions are certainly a major point in their favor. The expansion they represent is sound and vital.

Point VIII. Civil defense, civil rights, immigration and encouragement of the arts.

Finally we need to open up deeper spiritual values in our own country. This is a time not only for scientific searching but soul-searching. We must place much greater emphasis on proper organization and planning of civil defense to protect the lives of our people in event of an attack. We should adopt substantially the basic points advanced in the Rockefeller report in this regard as follows: (1) An attack-proof radio net to broadcast instructions during and after an attack; (2) a program of shelters to protect against radioactive fallout; (3) stockpiling food supplies and industrial reserves to prevent famine and enable the early resumption of economic activity.

The civil-rights effort to obtain equal opportunity for all by law, so portentous to our moral standing generally and especially with the peoples whose skin is yellow or black and who represent two-thirds of the population of the free world should be pressed in a new spirit of patriotism.

There should be a renewed emphasis upon the dignity of learning and scholarship and upon religious brotherhood.

While we wage this fight to erase discrimination against minority groups at home, we must on the other hand liberalize our immigration laws particularly to remove the racial discrimination inherent in our

national-origins quota system which sharply limits the entry of freedom-loving peoples who are refugees and escapees from Communist or religious persecution, who were born in southern and eastern Europe or the Far East or the Caribbean.

Our Government, which is far behind most of the civilized world in the encouragement of the arts, should now undertake a fair role consistent with our traditions in encouraging them by the establishment, for example, of a United States Arts Foundation. We have excellent examples in the similar agencies set up by Canada and the United Kingdom.

In advancing these programs I am well aware of the cost. I fully believe that our people are prepared to spend whatever it takes to win this struggle. I believe our people place a lower priority on tax reduction and national debt limits than they do on national security. The people will want a dollar's worth for a dollar spent and they will want hardheaded administration of what is appropriated, but they will not let the cost stand in the way of achieving the result. American business, always so properly solicitous about budget balance, needs to back these essential expenditures and not to discourage them.

Fortunately, expert economic analyses tell us that we could increase defense spending by 25 percent in the next 2 years without raising taxes or unbalancing the budget, in view of the foreseeable growth of the national economy between now and 1960. Also, we must note that the Soviet Union is spending approximately 25 percent of its gross national product for national security purposes while we will be spending less than 10 percent of our gross national product.

Indeed, it is the Russians who are close to starving their people for the sake of arms. From now on it is they who will pay the heaviest penalties for increased expenditures, particularly as we start from the base of a gross national product almost three times theirs with a smaller population. As the President clearly stated in his budget message, the national debt limit must be increased. The Treasury believes that we are now and will be until March 1958, within a few hundred million dollars of the \$275 billion national debt limit with very small cash balances. There is very little margin for unexpected contingencies, and we cannot allow ourselves in a time of such emergency to be so limited. We have a substantial reserve strength to call upon, as our Federal debt-incurring policy has been very conservative since 1956, the national debt decreasing noticeably as a proportion of the national income. In 1946, the public debt was larger than our entire national income that year—136 percent, but in June 1957, it represented slightly one-half of the 1946 ratio, 75 percent, the lowest ratio in the postwar era.

Confidence in our position is essential and fully justified. We have already demonstrated it in the competition with the Soviet Union. I speak now in terms of the appeal to the great neutralist areas of the world trying to make up their minds between freedom and communism, like those in Southeast Asia, and the Middle East. Certainly in the strictly moral sense in terms of individual human dignity, freedom of religion, speech, press and movement, due process of law and similar safeguards, there should be no question of the preference of their peoples.

But beyond this, ours is the science of life, while the Soviets' is the science of death. While they have forged ahead in developing missiles and rockets to carry atomic and hydrogen warheads, we have developed the Salk vaccine to eliminate the dread scourge of polio and aureomycin to banish trachoma, the deadliest disease affecting the 1 billion people in the areas of the free world needing development.

It is the Russians, not we, who have assailed the world with threats of destruction by rocket weapons. Their use has been threatened by Moscow against Britain and France on November 5, 1956, the time of the Suez crisis, against Holland in March 1957, against Great Britain again in April of 1957, against West Germany in December of 1957 in connection with their adherence to NATO, against Lebanon in March of 1957 in connection with the Jordan crisis, and even against ourselves on December 11, 1957, in connection with the proposal to station nuclear weapons in the German Federal Republic as an element of NATO. While on our part, though the most powerful nation on earth, we have treated as equals the smallest and newest nations in working out agreement on various issues with full respect for national sovereignty and have absorbed reverses in such negotiations without protests or threats—witness our dealing with Iceland and Morocco. While the free world, strongly aided by the United States, has been releasing 600 million people from colonial status since the end of World War II and brought about the establishment of 19 new nations, the Russian leaders have kept millions enslaved against their will in the Baltic States, in East Germany, and in Eastern Europe, and repressed by force and terror, as in Hungary, any sign of self-determination.

Finally, wherever there has been partition of an area between the Communist and free world, the free world area has shown bright by comparison, witness West and East Berlin, West and East Germany, South and North Korea, Vietnam and Viet Minh, Formosa and Communist China. It is estimated that for 10 years, 4,000 to 6,000 peoples a week have escaped from Communist East to free West Germany; in Hungary, Poland, even in Yugoslavia, this experience has occurred whenever there was the slightest chance to get out from under the Communists' self-styled utopia.

We have ascended a new plateau of world relations. We have in sight the organization of the world by regions, succeeding the nation state as communities of interest and sovereign entities. We can see the means for attaining peace and internationally accepted law and order. We cannot and should not fight the march of progress in human dignity and understanding or those who would make contributions to it. But we should have confidence in the fact that with work and sacrifice the basically superior moral and spiritual values of the free world will assert themselves as well in this new context as in the old. But it will take time, measured not in days or months but in years and decades. This time we must use for the benefit of mankind. We can lose no time in getting at this task.

The Leading Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 30, 1958

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following broadcast:

THE LEADING QUESTION

(Broadcast over the CBS Radio Network, January 15, 1958)

Mr. BANCROFT. Well, this Congress, called by some our first space-age Congress, now has pretty much in detail President Eisenhower's legislative program. In his state of the Union message and his budget the President has

proposed in the months ahead Congress will be disposing and, of course, it may go ahead and do some proposing on its own, especially as the Congress is controlled by one political party and the White House by another. So, the essential question now is, What will Congress do? And to discuss that, we have two veteran Members of the House, the Democratic leader, Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, and the Republican whip, or assistant leader, Congressman LESLIE C. ARENDS, of Illinois.

Well, Mr. MCCORMACK, you are the leader in the House of the party running this Congress, so let's start with you.

What can we expect of this session of Congress?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, it is true, Mr. Bancroft, I am the leader in the House of the party in control of the Congress, but there is a responsibility resting upon all Republican Members to have a due regard and to follow their own leadership in the White House, who is President Eisenhower.

I think the big question confronting all of us is the question of national security and foreign affairs. That is the matter which transcends political considerations, directly affects our country as such and all of our people. This Congress will cooperate effectively with President Eisenhower in any leadership he gives for a strong America, because the only thing the Communists respect is what they fear and that is military power greater than they possess themselves.

In connection with this, there will be bills out of the Armed Service Committee, which are already acting very quickly. There would be appropriations, adequate appropriations; there will be research and development; there will be the giving of information, imparting of certain information to our allies in NATO. There is the debt limit, there is the Presidential disability in addition to that. There is aid to scientific education and other fields of education and the question of the aid to construction in the field of education; the extension in the minimum-wage laws; increase in postal rates, which have already passed the House. There will be the pay raise bills for postal employees and for other Federal classified employees. Then, of course, there will be farm legislation and the indications are that this administration is going to reduce the price supports, and there will be legislation in relation to housing where there is an increase in interest rates, which I think is otherwise—

Mr. BANCROFT. Well, Mr. MCCORMACK, that's quite a list. Let's see what Mr. ARENDS has to say about that. Do you agree with all that?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Of course, that is only partial, but go ahead.

Mr. ARENDS. First, let me say that I am pleased to be on this program with the majority leader this morning, Mr. MCCORMACK. We have often enjoyed these little visits together on the radio.

I think Mr. MCCORMACK set forth most of the fundamental problems that we will have to consider during this session of Congress. There may be a few more of them, but several of them are basic and he particularly referred to the two on which, of course, we must have unity and cooperation, namely, national security and our foreign affairs, the mutual aid program such as they call it. The things that must be done in the interest of all America, free America and free people all over the world. Those are the basic problems as I see them.

Innumerable other problems come before us, some which, at this particular time, I would say, seem impossible to solve. Yet those are our responsibilities and we must try to meet up with them, which I am sure this Congress will make every effort so to do.

Mr. BANCROFT. Well, Mr. ARENDS, in addition to your position as Republican whip,

you are a member of the Armed Services Committee and Mr. MCCORMACK mentioned bills out of that committee, do you think—do you think Congress will do everything the President asked, or more than the President has asked, or what?

Mr. ARENDS. I am certain they will do everything that the President has asked and there are many members who I imagine will want to even go further. Already, our committee has passed an authorization bill, which you know about, with the idea in mind that we implement exactly the kind of a program that the country must have at this particular time in view of the changes, different concept of war and so on and so forth.

So we are moving rapidly ahead on that particular phase of our problem. It will be done hurriedly I think, but yet it will be done after we have carefully scrutinized what the requests are, because all we want to do is to be helpful and do the necessary things which can advantageously correct some of the things maybe we should have done a little earlier.

Mr. BANCROFT. Mr. MCCORMACK, are you satisfied with what the President is proposing in the defense field?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, the President's message in my opinion was the best one he has made. Whether it meets the challenge of the day or not, that is another question. I might—I have my opinion on that. I think, however, that we—the best thing that we can do is to try and convey, to the people of the country, information that is for the best interest of our country. I do not look for a bitter session in the sense of political bitterness, because certainly this is not the time to have any political bitterness. I do not stand for that kind of leadership anyway. I am a Democrat and I believe in the Democratic Party. It's the best party to—for the people to have in control of our Government. On the other hand, over and above party considerations, whether we are Democrats or Republicans, we are all Americans and there is a great crisis confronting the world, not only the United States, but other free nations, and we have got to think and govern ourselves in the manner that will most effectively serve the national interest of our country and the best interest of our people.

And I hope and I am sure that my friends on the Republican side, from the President down, will keep that also in mind, because they are going around the country in a few days making political speeches, which is perfectly all right and I—and at the different dinners and raising money to help their party. But I suggest to them that they do nothing to create bitterness from the President down.

Mr. ARENDS. Well, JOHN—Congressman MCCORMACK—I think that's all right. I believe we are all motivated by the same objective, namely, a loyalty to country which all of us want to discharge. We will do that. Of course, we have run into fundamental questions of leadership in the country. It happens that the White House is—the administration is Republican and it happens that the Congress is Democratic. Of course, I would like to see it the other way. You know being minority whip isn't near as pleasant as being majority whip. But that happens by the will of the people. I don't think it is so good when you have one party in control of the legislative branch and another one in control of the executive branch. I wish it were the other way, regardless of which party might be in control, because I think you can work better, work more in unity from a party angle than before.

However, these problems that come before us now, those as we mentioned a moment ago, defense and mutual aid and some of the other problems which effect all our people, of course, we are going to have to be

patriotic individuals; look at it objectively and then do the best job we possibly can. We will have our little squabbles politically about some other phases of the program and on that, of course, the people are not going to object.

Mr. BANCROFT. You both mentioned mutual aid or foreign aid and from all we hear there is liable to be a controversial matter on this issue. How about that, Mr. MCCORMACK, do you think Congress will approve what the President has asked?

Mr. MCCORMACK. We had difficulty last year. There is more and more resistance developing against it. It isn't from my angle, because I think it is very important and a vital part in carrying out our foreign policy. The more we can do to prevent nation after nation from becoming dominated by the Kremlin, communism, I think the better it is for the national interest of our country. It is one of those hard ones, but we have got to face it, those charged with responsibility. I think the bill will go through that will be substantially—carry out the purposes consistent with our national interests. It is going to be a hard fight and the leadership on both sides appreciate it. There is an honest difference of opinion among Members. Not injecting politics, but I think we have got to expect a few more votes from your side of the aisle, Congressman ARENDS, in the fight that is coming up this year, not only on mutual aid, but also on reciprocal trade agreements.

Mr. ARENDS. Well, let me say, Mr. MCCORMACK, that on this matter of mutual aid and certainly I do—I never like to hear it called as giveaway program, because I—

Mr. MCCORMACK. That's a wrong name.

Mr. ARENDS. That is the wrong term; yes.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I agree with you. It is for the—there may be some mistakes in administration, but the basic purpose is for the national interest of our country. I don't mean to interrupt—didn't mean to interrupt you.

Mr. ARENDS. That is all right, because I think you will recall that those of us of leadership on our side of the aisle, even when the program was instituted back in the days of the Marshall plan, we all got right in there and began to do our job as Americans in trying to be helpful in the matter. And have right from that time on supported this mutual aid program.

There may be a difference in degree as to amount, but yet we have all objectively tried to do something in this respect. And the responsibility does fall on the leadership on the majority side as well as on our side. And I think that we will do everything humanly possible to put forth a good program which will fill the bill, so to speak, in meeting the needs.

Mr. BANCROFT. As the Republican whip, your responsibility is lining up Republican votes, do you think you will line up a lot of Republican votes for reciprocal trade—

Mr. ARENDS. I must tell you a fact. I must recite this to you, that last year there was more support on our side of the aisle in numbers, than there had been previously in any one year, and I have the figures available. And we are more in numbers—the percentage of Members we have on the floor of the House, we did have more support. And I rather imagine that we will come up just about that way again this year.

Mr. BANCROFT. I wonder if we could get to the economic problems here. The President, as you know, has just asked for an increase in the limit of the national debt. I presume Congress is going to give him that, but what about legislation in general to combat recessions, with a business downturn, do you think anything like that will be coming up, Mr. MCCORMACK?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, that depends upon future developments. There is no question but what there is a recession under way,

how—to what extent it will go, the next 3 or 4 months will show. If it increases and becomes greater with resultant unemployment and reduced business, then Congress may have to take some action to try and cushion the downward trend and to reverse it and make our contribution towards reversing it in connection with business; try and get us back into normalcy again.

I look for further recession. I hope it doesn't get marked, because none of us want to see recession in business and a resultant unemployment take place. We want to see this constant expansion of our national economy. And I am satisfied that if the situation arises where legislation and action in the legislative level is necessary that it will be taken.

Mr. ARENDS. Let me say, Mr. McCORMACK, that possibly I am more of an optimist than you are, but—and not being an economist, I have tried to study a little bit some of these economic reports from the various economists throughout the country, at various meetings they have had, and while they are all pretty much in agreement that we are moving sideways, I see no clear indication anywhere that they are anticipating any such thing as a recession. Now, there is a dip, and we have peaks and valleys through our economy; we have had for years and probably always will have. And I think this possibly is some kind of a little valley on which before the end of this calendar year is out, we'll see our working self—working ourselves out in good shape, and I believe that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, Mr. ARENDS, I think there is a little bit more than a dip going on, if you judge—see the unemployment rolls mounting, the highest in many years. You see—you watch the number of bankruptcies taking place, increasing tremendously; you see the carloadings being reduced; you see the heavy goods—industry, sharply reducing its activities; seeing inventories being reduced. Those are all cautious actions of responsible businessmen, but in looking at our overall economy, the objective mind cannot fail to evaluate them. And I would say that there is more than a dip and I am not a pessimist by any means, but I expect that further recessions—to what extent it will go I am unable to state now, and I don't think anyone is able to state at the present time with accuracy.

Mr. BANCROFT. Well, the budget that's been sent down here is, of course, theoretically a balanced one, but few people—at least a great many people don't seem to think it is going to stay that way.

Are you very afraid of an unbalanced budget, of deficit spending?

Mr. ARENDS. Well, of course, balanced budgets are always desirable and that has been one of the things that the Republican Party has been trying to do over the last few years. And until this supplemental deficiency came up, why we were in the position of where, for the third straight year, we were having a balanced budget. But because of the requirements and necessities of national defense, why the budget this year will probably end up slightly out of balance.

Now the newly proposed budget, again, is in balance. It's a question of what Congress does. We have control of the purse strings up here, and at this particular time, I would hesitate to venture a guess as to what we will do. Will we be courageous enough to meet the issue head on and say, "This we need for defense, this we need for mutual aid," and on some of the projects and programs we already have in force, which might well be delayed for some time, we say, "Let's put this off temporarily in order to keep a balanced budget."

Frankly, I do not know what the reaction of the Members is going to be.

Mr. BANCROFT. Mr. McCORMACK, what do you think about a balanced budget?

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, the balanced budget is always desirable, but between a balanced budget and a safe and sound and effective national defense, I am for safe and sound and effective national defense.

Mr. ARENDS. And so will the 435 Members of the House be.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would think that most of them would. Of course, we have got the highest peacetime budget ever given in the history of our country for two successive years. And this present budget contemplates reduction in domestic activities in the field of agriculture, rural electrification, slum clearance, probably an attempt to take away some of the rights under the law of the veterans. Housing is going to be affected by increase—attempted increase in interest rates. The change in the law on mortgage support at par is also recommended; public works practically closed, new public works are closed. That's a matter of interest to our people all over the country, and particularly in different parts of the country where projects are located. Hospital construction is being affected, vocational training and waste treatment plant construction and other activities have all been affected adversely in this budget. And I doubt very much if the Congress of the United States is going to permit all of those adverse effects to go through. I know I wouldn't agree with them.

Mr. ARENDS. Let me say, Mr. McCORMACK, that—I say this respectfully—you are reading some things in the budget I didn't see. I didn't see anything in the budget about reduction of payments to veterans. I don't believe it was in there.

Mr. McCORMACK. I said it was contemplated.

Mr. ARENDS. I think you must have picked that up somewhere else.

Mr. McCORMACK. No, no. I said there is a message that is contemplated by another message. A very indication.

Mr. ARENDS. Well, the message isn't here yet and—that's anticipated.

Now, you mentioned agriculture, reduction in agriculture. That's a problem I know something about. Now, I am not at all sure that what there is proposed in doing away with the so-called acreage reserve—but that isn't a proper step. And I think you will probably your own Agriculture Committee controlled by your party agreeing to that. In other words, by simply writing a law, Congress has not been able to solve the agricultural problem. And they recognize the difficulties in the present situation. So, I believe they are in agreement with the Secretary of Agriculture that that particular step should be taken. Now, what they have in the way of a future proposal, possibly brought up during this session, whether it is a package bill or not, that's another question. I think in this particular instance, you'll find most everyone in the House wants the understanding they are going to be in agreement, which includes the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, there is a cut in the price supports that certainly is proposed, aimed at curbing surpluses and reducing the cost of acquiring surpluses.

My position in agriculture is, that it is a very important segment of American life and of American economy. The farmer buys in a protected market and sells his surpluses on the world market, which is unprotected. And I think as a national policy coming from a district where there is not one farm located, that the farmer is entitled to compensatory, some kind of compensatory consideration that's given to industry through tariff protection. So it isn't any giveaway, it's a matter of national interest of our country to keep our agriculture alive and dynamic. It's important from the angle of national defense, as you know. It's important from the angle of our national economy. The farmer is a very substantial

purchasing power and when they are depressed, it's only a matter of a year or two when the workers in the factories of the cities commence to lose their jobs.

So with the industry getting the protection of tariff, the farmer not having it, you give him all the protection in the world, you know if he has an exportable surplus he has got to sell it on the world market at the world prices and the protection don't mean a thing for him. Or when there is an exportable surplus, we have had a national policy to keep a very dynamic agricultural life, we have got to devise some means of enabling him to have compensatory considerations against those given to industry.

Mr. ARENDS. Well JOHN—Mr. McCORMACK—Congressman, I can agree with that, and I think Congress should work toward that end. The difficulty is finding the answer and getting our Agriculture Committee to come in here with something on which we can all agree.

Unfortunately, we see our agriculturalists, our so-called agriculture block broken down geographically, we see them broken down from the standpoint of commodity interest and so forth.

Now, what we should do and I wholeheartedly agree with you, we must keep agriculture as a whole economically prosperous and because it is a segment of our economy which is so important, because eventually it is reflected someplace else in the purchasing power of everyone; that the responsibility falls on us in the Congress to forget the politics involved in this whole question, which as you and I both know so well, because I was in the middle of this fight last year. It became so political that we got nowhere.

Now, this year I hope and pray, that somehow we can sit down and see, as reasonable men, if we can come up with a solution that will bring about the answer. I am not sure we have it yet.

Mr. BANCROFT. There is one other thing the President proposed in this budget message, to keep his budget in balance, and that was a 5-cent postage stamp.

How about that, Mr. McCORMACK, do you think Congress in this election year will go for a 5-cent postage stamp?

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, that bill has already passed the House.

Mr. BANCROFT. For a 5-cent stamp?

Mr. McCORMACK. The House was 4 cents. Mr. ARENDS. We passed a four.

Mr. McCORMACK. Four cents. I think the administration is probably a little ambitious in going to 5 cents. I doubt if they would go to 5 cents in first-class mail and—but the House has already passed the bill and that is over in the Senate now and it is reasonable ground—there is reasonable ground to believe that that bill in some form will pass the Senate and become law.

Mr. BANCROFT. Do you agree?

Mr. ARENDS. Yes; I think that is true. I think we will pass some kind of a rate-increase bill this time.

Mr. BANCROFT. Well, I wonder if we could come back for a moment to the defense problems which you both listed as the most important one and as we said—

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, because that's most important, Mr. Bancroft, because the very life and existence of our country is centered around—

Mr. BANCROFT. I don't think there is any disagreement about that, but it has a lot of aspects and Mr. ARENDS is on the Armed Services Committee.

One thing, what about the reorganization of the Defense Department, of a single Chief of Staff, or a missile czar, or what is going to come of that?

Mr. ARENDS. I wonder if I might have a little bit of time to try and answer that. Because being the ranking Republican on the committee and so intensely interested in this whole thing, I have some viewpoints.

First, let me say that our committee, although I think we've started late and I had urged that we start earlier, we have now started day before yesterday on extensive, thorough hearings before our committee. These are in executive session. Thirty-seven-man committee, the House Armed Services Committee. And I believe Mr. McCORMACK, the majority leader, will agree with me that we have always had prestige on the floor of the House, that we have been a fair committee, we are absolutely nonpartisan, we have tried to be objective; we are under the leadership of a fine chairman and this committee has now—is now diligently trying to come up with some of the answers to the problems that face us in relation to our national security.

We started, for instance, day before yesterday with Secretary McElroy. For two long days he sat before our committee and completely and frankly answered all the questions that our boys could put to him, and I must say there are some very capable individuals on both sides of the chairman sitting there, to ask questions.

We are going through this thing. We are going to have today, General Twining, who is Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. We will have the respective heads of the services. And right on down, including all the scientists. We are going to explore the whole field, which takes in not only the missile field, but takes in this question you brought up about the Joint Chiefs of Staff, whether there should be reorganization.

We hope to go into the whole business of missions and assignments and anything that must be done and which they can convince us should be done for the good of the country. I believe our committee will be able to come out with some forthright, objective recommendations. And it is our responsibility. And I am convinced that we are just determined to do a good job, once we have the time to do it and we have the time.

Mr. BANCROFT, Mr. McCORMACK, are you going to sit by and wait now for this committee to—

Mr. McCORMACK. I can enter no criticism or contrary statement to what Congressman ARENDS said about his committee. It is a great committee, the members act without regard to political partisan considerations. The Committee on Armed Services, we have got to look to them. And they are making this investigation and—in executive session, and the results of it will come out—will be reported to the people, to the Congress and to the people when they have completed them.

I hope they will thoroughly look into the whole question of responsibility, because certainly it appears as though in some fields we are behind the Soviet Union, because I am firmly convinced that if the Soviet Union ever gets to a position where they have an advantage over us where they can hit us, our targets, and we can't get to their targets, Mr. ARENDS, they are not going to let us catch up with them. They will hit us and we had better be prepared, because as I said before, the only thing they respect is what they fear and that is military power greater than they possess.

Might I suggest, Congressman ARENDS, in your investigations, also look into the field of biological research, chemical research, because—psychological, but particularly biological and chemical, why—it is amazing to find out how far advanced we are, to try and find out how far the Soviets are, because that field alone is of vast importance. The people read and talk about ballistics, well there are other fields and you know it as well as I do, better. And I hope that you—you'll see that you—you'll take up with the chairman and other members of the committee the question of looking into those two things.

Mr. ARENDS. Let me say to you, Mr. McCORMACK, that as I said, many, many able fellows are on our committee. And already yesterday, those questions were mentioned. We will go into those particular fields too, the biological, the chemical—in other words, I think that this is going to be such a comprehensive hearing, that we really can do a job, not only for the Congress, but certainly for the country in our final analysis of this picture as we see it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree, and may I make one further suggestion. When you get into those fields—it's all right to hear from the Secretary and the Assistant Secretaries, but get down to the operating level of the men who are in command of those activities and who never appear before, probably never appear before committees, and see that they—the only way they can get before a committee is where they are asked to come before them. I would get to the actual commanding and operating heads of those services.

Mr. ARENDS. Our chairman has already indicated to the members, that if we have anyone in mind at all who think that—who we feel might make a contribution, that we should ask them to come before the committee. In other words, there is just no pulling of punches here at all. In other words, we are trying to do a job.

Mr. BANCROFT. One of the perhaps longer range defense things that the President has—is asking about is education, helping of schools and some seem to think that he doesn't go far enough and others that he goes too far. What do you think Congress is apt to do about education, Mr. McCORMACK?

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, I think, Mr. BANCROFT, that I'd be interested in listening to what my good friend, Congressman ARENDS, has to say in that. If he can tell me how many Republican votes we are going to get in the House, I could answer the question better.

Mr. BANCROFT. There you are, Mr. ARENDS, what about that?

Mr. McCORMACK. Because when this school construction bill came up, a clear majority of the Democrats voted to pass it, the Republicans voted the other way. I am not mentioning how anybody voted. Many Members voted, but if you could get information from Congressman ARENDS, that's a very important question—

Mr. BANCROFT. We will certainly try, how about it?

Mr. ARENDS. Would you permit me to go back just a minute and mention my own position, because I am on the Armed Services Committee, in relation to this one problem you brought up a minute ago about the Joint Chiefs of Staff and reorganization? I think possibly—I know we are going to look into this whole reorganization picture. But as one individual who has studied this matter over the years, I am still opposed to one—single Chief of Staff position, just like the chairman of my committee is. I have serious doubts that any such thing will happen, or be passed by this Congress at this particular time.

You bring up the question of what happened last year, Mr. McCORMACK, in relation to—

Mr. McCORMACK. I didn't bring that up. I mean—

Mr. ARENDS. I refuse to be put in a position of I predict, and say it, but I—by the time we have the matter up for consideration on the floor of the House, I'll give you a good estimate if you come around and see me. I think we are going to be in pretty good position on this thing according to the type of program sent up here and that of course is still unknown—

Mr. BANCROFT. I'm afraid we've now run out of time and thank you both for being with us on our leading question.

Address by Hon. John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, at the 58th Annual Dinner of the Cathedral Club of Brooklyn, January 23, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 30, 1958

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an address made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] at the 58th annual dinner of the Cathedral Club of Brooklyn tendered to Most Rev. Byron F. McEntegart, D. D., in honor of his appointment as bishop of Brooklyn, which dinner took place the evening of January 23, 1958, in Brooklyn, N. Y.

The address follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, Your Excellency, most reverend bishop of Brooklyn, right reverend monsignor, reverend fathers, my close and valued friend, one of the most distinguished Members of Congress, Congressman ROONEY, members of the State, county, and city governments, members of the judiciary, distinguished and invited guests, and officers and members of the Cathedral Club of the Brooklyn diocese and your friends, in extending my appreciation for your invitation, I am particularly pleased to be with you on this occasion in the presence of a great churchman and a great American whom I have known for years, and whose friendship I greatly value, your beloved bishop and spiritual leader, Most Rev. Byron F. McEntegart. In succeeding another great bishop, your late beloved archbishop, Bishop McEntegart will give to the Brooklyn diocese, noted for the strong faith of its people, leadership that will intensify the same. Catholic University's loss of Bishop McEntegart as its rector is the gain of the Brooklyn diocese.

I also was particularly pleased to receive your invitation through my good friend and colleague, Congressman ROONEY, who is one of the ablest and most influential Members of the Congress, enjoying the confidence and respect of his colleagues. I might also say that the Congressional delegation from Brooklyn is a very strong and influential one in the Congress of the United States.

The policy of peace through strength, and possessing that strength, is more important and vital today than it has been since the existence of the Communist threat.

For the only thing that the evil-minded men in the Kremlin respect is what they fear—and that is military strength and power greater than they possess themselves.

This does not mean that military strength alone is our sole element of power, for in any severe test moral strength is of inestimable importance that could well be the deciding influence and factor between victory and defeat.

The Holy Father has clearly evidenced this in his number of messages to the world, and particularly in his Christmas message of the last 2 years—dynamic messages affirmative in nature, and charting the road for the men and women to follow who want to be free under their own law.

But military strength and power is necessary in the world today.

And that is consistent with the moral law because it is intended by us to implement and strengthen our moral forces, and to effectively resist the efforts of the Soviet

Union in its attempt of world domination or destruction.

For our military strength, and this includes our allies, is to preserve independence of nations, and liberty of peoples under their own law. Such military strength is designed for constructive purposes, to be utilized as an instrument of world peace.

The intent of this military power of atheistic communism is to conquer and dominate the entire world by any means possible, with slavery, persecution, imprisonment, death and even martyrdom following such domination.

As long as communism remains as presently constituted, and until its leaders repudiate or renounce atheistic and dialectic communism, it is vitally necessary that we remain powerful from a military angle.

And the price we pay and the sacrifices we make are necessary for our preservation and for future generations to possess and enjoy as now constituted in our institutions of government.

For we cannot afford to be second best to the Soviet Union and its military strength and power.

If it develops, for example, that we must choose between a balanced budget and an adequate and strong military strength, we had better decide in favor of strong military strength.

We must bear in mind that the main avenue of success, if any, in the field of diplomacy is the strength and power of our military forces. For such strength is the only language the Communists know and heed. In other words, if any success comes through diplomatic negotiations, and you will note my guarded words, it will be due mainly to our military strength and power and the respect of the Soviets for such strength and power.

I have said repeatedly in and outside of the Halls of Congress that we cannot negotiate with the Communists on the moral level, because they not only deny, but are fighting God and His word and law in the minds of those who believe in Him; Catholic, Protestant, and Jew. We cannot negotiate with them on the level of idealism because they have no ideals; but there is one level on which we can possibly negotiate with them, and that is on the level of the law of self-preservation.

For the Communists can close their minds to spiritual truths and to ideals, but they cannot deny there is a law of self-preservation. They cannot deny or ignore the indisputable fact that this law applies to Red Russia and its people, as well as to other countries and their peoples.

And as long as we have at least retaliatory power, short of a possible revolution arising within Russia, it is a reasonable probability that the evil-minded men in the Kremlin will not undertake to destroy another nation and its people if before the act of destruction or mass murder is completed, the Soviet Union and its people commit suicide.

And this is one of the main reasons why we must pay the price necessary for military strength—to deter—and if madmen attack, to be able to destroy the aggressor.

Strong military strength as an affirmative threat is also a deterrent to attack, enabling as we hope in the future, affirmative influences to operate with the ultimate objective of undermining and destroying communism.

And if we are going to err in judgment on the question of strength or weakness, it is better that we err on the side of strength than on the side of weakness.

For we must remember that the meaning and significance of little Hungary still exists in the minds of men and women everywhere who want their own independence, and freedom under their own law. Hungary has clearly shown that the Soviet Union cannot rely upon any one of its satellites behind the Iron Curtain.

Who can tell when another Hungary may suddenly and spontaneously happen in some other satellite nation such as Poland or East Germany.

For the God given right of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, in other words, the desire for freedom, may be temporarily suppressed by totalitarian or dictator nations, but can never be destroyed.

And while communism, and even to a limited degree, liberty, because of different motives and reasons, may temporarily travel the same road together, they cannot permanently travel that same road. And this is particularly so as long as communism, as presently constituted, adheres to its intents and purposes.

And we must bear in mind that military strength is relative in nature, and our strength must have a relationship to our potential enemy, the Soviet Union.

Coming directly to the happenings of the present and recent months, it is evident that everyone knows or senses that an urgency exists. Everyone knows or senses everything is not all right.

There is no question but what an urgency exists and that in certain military fields everything is not all right. This observation might also be made in other directions. However, in my remarks tonight I am confining my thoughts to the immediate situation that confronts us.

The question confronting us is whether or not the urgency of the situation is being met.

We read the newspapers, and we know of the differing testimony given by high-ranking military men and officials.

Who and what can we believe?

Who is right? Are the American people being given all possible information? Is the Congress being given full information?

To refresh your memory, a high-ranking general's resignation will become effective soon, and one of his reasons for resigning was, he could not remain in Washington another year and—I quote him—"go through another session" and "be silent listening to inaccurate testimony" being given to committees of Congress. These are serious statements and charges. One thing is certain, that the Congress must be fully informed in order to perform its constitutional duty to legislate and appropriate for an adequate national defense.

Our people should be as fully informed as possible, the bad with the good news. In order to help them form a sound, rational public opinion as to what our policy should be.

For under democratic institutions of government, public opinion is a powerful factor. Some have said that its influence and power is greater than Presidents, governors, and Members of Congress and other public officials. In any event, whether sound or emotional, whether right or erroneous, under the constitutional government, public opinion exercises a powerful influence. In order to be sound and rational, the public must be as fully informed as our national security will permit:

And it is in connection with forming of sound public opinion that you and other Americans can make a marked contribution toward proper policy being made, and of quick and necessary action being taken thereon.

Another prominent general recently complained that in appearing before committees, they are put in the embarrassing position of supporting the policy, including appropriations submitted by the administration, and if they testify otherwise, they face the charge of insubordination, or are placed in the position of falsifying before the committees.

It is a most unfortunate position for these men to be put in. I can sympathize with them. But if gagging generals and others in the executive branch is successful, carrying this to its natural and ultimate conclusion, it would result in the gagging of Con-

gress, a separate and coordinate branch of our Government. This would reduce Congress to simply a must body and prevent it from carrying out its constitutional duties and responsibilities.

It will be a sad day for America if that situation ever comes about.

The problem facing this particular general and others in the same position is not within the Congress of the United States, but within the executive branch.

All of this has an effect on the Congress obtaining all necessary information to make decisions, pass legislation, and the making of appropriations necessary for the national interest and the national defense of our country.

We have read in recent months about the Soviet sputnik, and some information on the progress the Soviets have made in the field of military research and development, and particularly in the field of ballistic missiles. Also, as to how far we have advanced in these fields; and the testimony in this respect to date is very vague.

It is quite evident from what you and I have read in the newspapers, and we can discuss what we read because that is not classified, that Red Russia is ahead of us in the field of intercontinental ballistic missiles, and also in the field of intermediate ballistic missiles—the latter field probably more than in the intercontinental field.

The very fact that they are able to project satellites into the outer space is evidence of marked advancement on their part in the discovery or unfolding of the means of projecting intercontinental ballistic missiles from one continent to another. However, there must be perfection in the missile arriving at its target. It appears that in the field of propulsion power, the Soviets are ahead of us, but they have not as yet arrived at that stage of perfection where, in using intercontinental ballistic missiles, the target can be hit with accuracy.

It is imperative that we devote all resources necessary to at least catch up in this field of science and technology, and in any others with military significance in which we are behind the Soviet Union.

As long as we have retaliatory power, it might operate as a deterrent to surprise attack. Our present deterrent power is in our intercontinental bombers and their present ability to reach their targets and, if necessary, their present ability to reach their targets in the Soviet Union. As long as they can reach their targets, they are a powerful offensive force and at the same time, might operate as a deterrent influence to any sneak attack.

We read in the newspapers of an anti-missile missile. Judging from the newspapers, we are working very hard in an effort to perfect this instrument. I assume that this is for defensive purposes and as a weapon or instrument intended to destroy ballistic missiles projected against us, as well as an instrument, with other means, of intercepting Russian bombers in case of attack. If so, it is fair to assume that the Soviets are working to devise and perfect a similar instrument. It is important that they do not do so before we perfect it.

These observations that I have made have a relationship to the urgency for speedup action on our part necessary at this time. For if the time ever should arrive where the Soviets could attack us and hit targets here, and we could not reach their targets, where they could act without fear of retaliation being successful, I seriously doubt if they will wait until we catch up with them.

It could happen if top management in our Government delays too long in doing the things that can and should be done.

We hear we are ahead in overall military power, but what does that really mean? We might be ahead today in overall military power, but will we be in a year or 18 months?

We all know that military weapons are changing so rapidly as a result of research and development that what might be an effective weapon today offensively or defensively, may not be a year or two from now.

In our national interest we must further basic research, and in the applied field, bear the expense of test after test, many of which will be failures, but which are necessary to bring about success and workability. If our Government does the things it should do, I am confident that we can catch up where we are behind. We have the brains—we have the facilities—and the Congress and our people will support the expenditure of all money necessary to catch up, at least where we are behind, and to go ahead of the Soviet Union before Red Russia has perfected the intercontinental ballistic missile, as well as the antimissile missile.

The fault mainly lies in management of our Government. It is necessary that top management act, and act quickly, to eliminate delays in decision making in our technological forces which has brought about uncertainty, and in some cases, confusion.

There must be a reassessment of the position of military research and development in the executive branch, and particularly in the Defense Department and its services.

On the top level there must exist the power to make decisions with the authority to carry them out. Other steps must be taken which have a direct relationship to the two primary steps I have mentioned.

We must remember that democracies do not engage in surprise attacks. I will not argue as to whether or not under certain conditions they should. If one does come, as you and I know, it will be carried out by our enemy. And the best way to deter such an attack is for the Free World, and our country in particular, to be so strong and powerful that the evil-minded men of the Kremlin will know that it would result in the destruction of their country and their people.

While I am frankly discussing an important aspect of our present situation, I do so with the knowledge that you and other Americans can accept information as to the conditions, and that the American people, if informed, will meet any challenge that confronts our country.

What I have said in relation to the field of ballistic missiles applies to other fields of modern warfare that the world killer minds in the Kremlin, if they get a decided advantage might resort to, such as chemical warfare, biological warfare, and psychological warfare.

As long as atheistic communism is bent on world domination, it is imperative that we keep our guard high and always have powerful offensive and retaliatory strength, and use all means possible for our best defense.

While no one with any degree of accuracy can gage or weigh the possibilities of the Communist mind, particularly those in the Kremlin, the Kremlin cannot deny that there is a law of self-preservation, and realize its meaning and significance in terms of their own country and their own people.

If our Government does the things that we know can and should be done, marshal our brains and our facilities and those of the Free World, with the necessary appropriations that will be forthcoming, within the time we have left before the Soviets obtain a decided advantage, we can catch up with them and go ahead of them, and the present fear that grips the Free World will vanish from our minds.

My remarks, as you will note tonight, are confined to the immediate situation that confronts us. We must consider first things first.

I have complete faith in America and its people. I have complete faith in men and women throughout the world who want to be free under their own law. I look forward with confidence that the things our Govern-

ment should do will be done, particularly now that public opinion is aroused. In this necessary action the Congress will play its effective part and in the legislative field give the necessary leadership.

And you and other Americans can do your part by helping to create a public opinion and demand that America be militarily strong; that if we are going to err, that we err on the side of strength rather than on the side of weakness.

As long as atheistic communism is bent on world revolution, and thereby world domination, it is imperative that America have such military strength and power.

I conclude my remarks by repeating what I have said before. The only thing the Communists respect is what they fear, and that is military strength and power greater than they possess themselves.

Safety Legislation for Small Boats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 30, 1958

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, for many months, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives has been studying the growing problem with regard to safety in the operation of small boats, the numbers of which have been increasing in recent years literally by the millions.

A few days ago, on January 20, 1958, before the National Association of Marine Dealers, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, summed up the progress which has been made and the steps which must presently be taken. His remarks will be of interest to each Member of the House. He is to be commended for his able approach to the problem and for the fine progress which has been made toward its solution.

I include, as a part of these remarks, a copy of the speech to which I referred:

REMARKS OF HON. HERBERT C. BONNER, DEMOCRAT, NORTH CAROLINA, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AT NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MARINE DEALERS' DINNER, PARK-SHERATON HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, JANUARY 20, 1958

President Styron, members of the National Association of Marine Dealers, ladies and gentlemen, when rising to my feet to speak, I like to recall the favorite motto of the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives. He told me that an old Texas friend sent him the motto which he keeps in his office in the Capitol. It reads: "You ain't larning when you're talkin'."

In any event, I can certainly promise you this: These remarks will be brief. I am sure that most of you want to get back to the Coliseum.

When President Styron invited Mrs. Bonner and me to be his guests at the National Motorboat Show and your guests at this reception and dinner, we were most happy to accept. The fact that your president is a brother Tarheel had nothing to do—of course—with our answer.

We have been impressed with your hospitality here in New York. And as a first-

time visitor to the boat show we have been a little overwhelmed. The boat show certainly proves that pleasure boating in this country is booming and is dear to the hearts of millions of Americans.

Our committee, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, first received an inkling of this when we started the pleasure-boat hearings 18 months ago. Boating, we soon discovered, was becoming the country's leading family recreation.

At this point I might pause to acknowledge in person the foresightedness of Mr. Ralph Klieforth and the National Association of Engine and Boat Manufacturers, which he heads, for the first suggestion that Congress make a broad-scale study of pleasure boating.

The study was indeed thorough, and everyone who had something to offer had an opportunity to speak his mind. I am sure that most of you know about the report made last April and the subsequent legislation introduced.

The committee held a brief hearing before adjournment, at which Vice Adm. Alfred Richmond, the Commandant of the Coast Guard, was the witness. Since that time, we have made an important step forward in establishing liaison with the Council of State Governments. A special committee made up of representatives from State governments, from the Coast Guard and from the staff of our committee has been working long and earnestly on this whole involved problem of coordinated Federal and State legislation.

Meanwhile, I would like to sound a word of caution. We must avoid at all cost any Tower of Babel in boating laws. I refer to the prospect of a hodgepodge of local, State, and Federal laws enacted at cross purposes without any master plan or guidance.

How can we avoid such a situation? I think it can be done through the following three points:

1. A moratorium on the well-meaning but, I am afraid, ill-advised activities of private organizations seeking to press their favorite plans for boating laws.

2. A model law for the States should be formulated at the earliest possible moment.

3. The outdated Motorboat Act of 1940 and the even older Numbering Act of 1918 should be brought up to the realities of boating in 1958.

On points 2 and 3, I can report excellent progress that promises well for the overall objective. That objective, of course, is uniform or nearly uniform boating laws throughout the land.

The special Federal-State committee just mentioned is working on perfecting the Federal bill—the Boating Act of 1958. And they are hard at work on a model State bill.

We have high hopes that their efforts will be completed successfully and the next step will be scheduled shortly. That step would be the calling of hearings by the Merchant Marine Committee on H. R. 8474, the Boating Act.

But before going into this, I must point out that the committee has a busy schedule ahead for this session.

Some of the other subjects are the building of a nuclear-powered icebreaker for the Coast Guard, authorizing a sister ship to the steamship *United States*, the question of pilotage on the Great Lakes, required because of the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, the issue of subsidies for American tramp ships, and an international meeting on safety of life at sea.

This gives you an idea of how active we are likely to be in the coming months.

In connection with the Boating Act, the committee has covered much of the ground in our extensive small-boat hearings in 1956 and 1957. It is my belief, therefore, that the hearings can be relatively brief. With that in mind, it is expected that sessions

could begin during the latter part of February, probably the week of February 24.

I have been in Congress too long, however, to make any firm prediction on when the legislation might be enacted into law. Conceivably it could occur this year.

But if it does not pass this year, a second and equally important phase of our overall objective can be achieved. I refer to the model law for the States, now under study by a special subcommittee of the Council of State Governments. If it can be presented to the States, with the blessing of the Council of State Governments by the end of this year, then they will have an authoritative guide for consideration when the majority of legislatures meet starting next January.

The Federal Boating Act could, of course, be reintroduced at that time in the new Congress, and presumably moved along with some dispatch. In that manner we might find a new Federal law coming into being at about the same time as State laws are enacted.

In the meantime there is much that dealers, manufacturers, and other boating interests can do in a voluntary program. Such a program was drawn up at the recent National Small Boat Safety Conference held in Washington at the suggestion of our committee. The idea behind the program was that there was much that could be done by the industry outside the field of legislation.

A good beginning has been made, and I wish you and the Coast Guard every success in carrying out the recommendations adopted at that important conference. It was gratifying, too, to note that the delegates to the conference realized the need to meet again—I believe next year.

There is, it seems to me, another important area that dealers, manufacturers, other boating groups, local governments and the financial community should concern themselves with. That is the problem of financing and building launching ramps, marinas and other facilities for the growing boating population.

I would like to propose that all of these groups get together the best minds in this field and see if a plan for solving this shortage problem can be evolved. The conference approach might be used again. We know that communities faced with strangulation of their downtown business areas, because of heavy traffic, have come up with some solutions—municipal parking areas and jointly financed parking garages, for example.

Could not some similar arrangement be worked out for boating? I have been told that in some boating areas a sale of a boat is often gained or lost on the basis of whether a slip or dock is available. At the present rate of sales, what is going to be the situation 5 years from now, unless you take some action?

You dealers have an important part to play in safety education, marina development and all the other problems I understand you have. When President Styron informed me last year of the formation of the National Association of Marine Dealers, I wrote him:

"From testimony received at points all over the country during our recreational boating study last year it seems to me that a great deal of good could be accomplished through a national association such as yours—as you say—at the point where the industry and the sport meet." The marine dealers of the country are the one group who come in contact with all boatowners.

"I take this occasion to wish you and your new association the best of luck and all of my good wishes for success in a venture that could go far toward increasing the safety and enjoyment of boating."

That is still my sentiment. The response to the idea of a national trade federation of associations and individual dealers appar-

ently has been beyond the expectations of the founders. I congratulate you again on your decision in forming the organization and may it prosper.

May the National Motor Boat Show prosper, too, and all United States pleasure boating.

And now to borrow from Speaker RAYBURN's motto again, there has been a lot of "talkin'" and, perhaps, a little "larnin'." Mrs. Bonner and I hope to be back again. Many thanks and good evening.

Mexico's Claim to Texas Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 30, 1958

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, now comes Mexico, who wants to lay claim to the territorial waters beyond the 3-mile limits of the United States.

As the Dallas Morning News points out, this is not as fantastic as it seems at first blush.

Following is what the Dallas Morning News has to say on that subject:

[From the Dallas Morning News of January 17, 1958]

MEXICO'S CLAIM TO TEXAS TIDELANDS

The possibility that Mexico may demand the 7.35-mile strip of Texas' tidelands, which Washington now claims, is not as fantastic as it might seem. At least, it is not as fantastic as Washington's claim in its latest suit against Texas.

As a former chairman of Texas' Good Neighbor Commission, Neville Penrose, of Fort Worth, has many warm friends among our next-door neighbors in Nuevo Leon, Tamaulipas, Chihuahua, and Coahuila. He serves the cause of the commission in reporting the study of such a move by legal experts south of the border. If Mexico decides to get into the act, it would indeed be neighborly. For it would buttress Texas' own claim to the vast underwater acreage at issue.

Mexico's position is logical enough. The seaward boundaries it inherited from Spain are 3 marine leagues, or 10.35 miles, from shore. When Texas seceded from Mexico, in 1836, it inherited the same limits from Mexico.

After Texas joined the American Union, Mexico acknowledged Texas' title to this width of tidelands in the Gulf of Mexico. That was in the Treaty of Guadalupe, which the United States also signed, presumably in equal good faith. Yet the United States now insists before the Supreme Court that Texas owns only out to the 3-mile limit.

In denying Texas' claim to this property, Washington should also admit that it still belongs to Mexico. To date, Texas has collected the dollar equivalent of 337,500,000 pesos in oil leases on this strip. Solvent as is the Ruiz Cortines government, it could doubtless use this tidy little sum.

Texas is getting tired of the doubletalk coming out of Washington. While the Justice Department says Texas is confined to the 3-mile limit, our State Department gives de facto recognition to Chile's claim to a 200-mile limit. It makes no protest when Texas shrimpers are penalized for violating Mexico's 3-league limit. When will this hypocrisy cease and Texas be treated as other than an unwanted stepchild?

In this connection it is indeed proper and appropriate to bring to the atten-

tion of the Congress what Judge Leander H. Perez of the parishes of St. Bernard and Plaquemines, La., had to say before the House Committee on the Judiciary on the operation of submerged lands at a hearing in New Orleans during the past November. This committee was headed by my learned and able colleague, EDWIN E. WILLIS of the Third Congressional District of Louisiana. It was a productive and constructive hearing.

Appearing before the committee was Judge Perez whom I consider to be the best informed man on the subject of the tidelands in the United States. I attribute Judge Perez's unrelenting and vigorous attention to the subject as the major factor in the fight which has been made and which is being made to reserve to the several States their just and due territorial jurisdiction and ownership. Others may have faltered and still others may have compromised but Judge Perez has held steadfastly in his beliefs and his devotion to the cause of preserving the rights of the States in this most important fight.

With your permission I herewith submit to you the full text of the testimony given by Judge Perez in November which is so applicable to the situation as it stands at this moment.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF LEANDER H. PEREZ, DISTRICT ATTORNEY, ST. BERNARD-PLAQUEMINES, LA.

Mr. PEREZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WILLIS. I know you have not been idle in the meantime.

Mr. PEREZ. I have not been idle, really.

Thanks for the opportunity of appearing before you just briefly, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen.

I am sure that in your hearing you received much evidence helpful in the drafting of legislation looking to proper regulation and conservation of mineral resources offshore in that area called the outer Continental Shelf; that is, Continental Shelf beyond State boundaries, as defined and quitclaimed in the Submerged Lands Act.

And my purpose in appearing before the committee today is the same as what I attempted to advocate when I appeared before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on May 30, 1953; and it is this:

Naturally, insofar as our domestic relations are concerned within our States and the United States, the authority for the enactment of laws looking to the regulation and conservation of these resources in the outer Continental Shelf rests with Congress. The application of any such laws finally is with the United States Supreme Court which exercises jurisdiction in matters of controversy between the United States and particularly with respect to the boundaries of the States in the Atlantic, the Gulf, or Pacific, beyond which the provisions of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act of Congress is intended to apply.

But I would like to leave this word of caution with the committee in the hope that it will make some impression with Congress and with the authorities in Washington. Regardless of what laws Congress may pass, regulating operations in the outer Continental Shelf, and what the aftermath may be as a result of the United States Supreme Court decisions restricting States historic boundaries to that as contended for by the State Department and the Department of Justice to 3 miles offshore, for which there is no basis of claim in law or in fact—this is the most important thing which we are overlooking. The final authority will not

be with the United States Supreme Court in these matters. I think we have learned to realize that we cannot underestimate our enemies. I would not be surprised to see, after our oil companies have spent hundreds of millions of dollars in exploration and development work, bringing out production in the outer Continental Shelf beyond the restricted State boundaries, that some controversy will be provoked in a higher authority than the United States Supreme Court, and that is the International Court of Justice.

We do know that Great Britain questioned the historic seaward boundaries of Norway. And we should not overlook the fact that in that case the International Court of Justice rendered its last decision on the question of seaward boundaries and it was based on the fact that although Norway claimed the extent of some 70 miles from shore seaward as its historic boundary, the International Court of Justice held with it but based its decision on this holding, and I quote:

"Historic waters are usually meant waters which are treated as internal waters but which would not have that character were it not for the existence of a historic title." And that, and I quote again:

"Norwegian sovereignty over these waters would constitute an exception, historic titles justifying situations which would otherwise be in conflict with international law."

Now, the claim of the United States to the outer Continental Shelf beyond the State's historic boundaries is of recent origin and certainly not of historic significance or application. It does not go beyond President Truman's proclamation in 1947 and the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act in 1953.

While your committee is studying these problems regarding legislation for regulating and protecting our resources in the Continental Shelf, serious study should be given to what may happen in the future if the present trend in Washington succeeds in restricting the States' boundaries to a mere 3 miles from shore, which would, in effect, surrender to an international court the decision of what happens to the submerged lands and resources beyond 3 miles, including our inland waters, because a line drawn 3 miles from shore would deprive our State of large areas of its inland waters.

Now, I do not want to go too much at length in the matter.

One thing we should bear in mind is this:

The United States Constitution gives to Congress alone the right to admit new States into the Union. Since adoption of the Constitution in 1789, Congress admitted 35 States, some inland and some coastal States, and in each instance Congress defined the limits of those States. It certainly makes no difference whether a State is coastal and has a limit extending out seaward or whether it is entirely inland. But we are up against a serious proposition because the representatives of the National Government are after restricting the States' historic seaward boundaries to 3 miles from shore and throwing out all that vast area into the outer Continental Shelf, when, as a matter of fact, a study of the historic boundaries of the States would show that there is not much of the Continental Shelf lying outside the States' historic boundaries.

I would like to leave with the committee a statement which I filed with the Senate Interior Committee on May 30, 1953. Attached to my statement is a map of the outer Continental Shelf, a map of the 20 leagues line of the original coastal States on the Atlantic Ocean as fixed in article II of the treaty which settled the War of the Revolution.

And over to the west on the Pacific, we must take into consideration the Guadalupe Hidalgo Treaty which settled the war between

Mexico and the United States, under which Mexico ceded to the United States everything north of the line extending to the Pacific coast. This included the islands lying off California, all of which was included in that State's seaward boundary 3 miles from coast by the act of Congress which admitted California as a State into the Union. Similar acts admitted Washington and Oregon, 3 miles from the coast into the Pacific Ocean.

If you will make a study of the old French official map of Louisiana Territory with the coastline drawn upon it, and compare it to the outer Continental Shelf, you will see that it establishes a historic title within the principles announced by the International Court of Justice, because our title then would date back to 1803 when France ceded the Louisiana Territory, and to 1812 when Congress fixed the boundary of Louisiana at 3 leagues from the coast into the Gulf of Mexico. The 20 leagues from shore in the Atlantic was fixed in the treaty which settled the War of the Revolution. The 6 leagues from coast boundary to which Florida is entitled, dates back to the 1763 proclamation of the British Crown, when Britain fixed the boundaries of the East and West Florida Territories. Later Britain ceded to Spain in 1783, and Spain in 1819 ceded the Florida Territories to the United States with the same boundaries extending as they were held by those governments.

We have gotten away from history and we are going to get into serious trouble sooner or later unless we adhere to State historic boundaries in the regulation of operations for development and conservation of our natural resources under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act.

It is a very serious matter for the Congress to consider primarily because I expect to see the United States Supreme Court go along with the State Department and the Attorney General's Office on the baseless claim that Thomas Jefferson wrote a letter when he was Secretary of State, and referred to the old cannon shot range of 3 miles. But Jefferson repudiated that story as having any significance. When he was President in 1807 he had Congress pass an act authorizing him as President to survey the coast of the United States within 20 leagues offshore. That was in keeping with the second article of the treaty with the British Crown which settled the War of the Revolution and fixed the boundaries of the Atlantic Coastal States as 20 leagues offshore.

I think we should all be concerned that politics has gotten into the State historic boundary question, with one side not wanting to be criticized by the liberals of the other side on the "giveaway" program. You have heard those speeches.

But the United States Government and the people of every State stand to lose, and we do not know what the future will hold. Possibly the United Nations will take them over eventually, if the International Court of Justice holds they do not belong to the United States, because there is no historic title to the claim of the outer Continental Shelf beyond the State boundaries. Then it would be a sad mess.

I hope I have not imposed on you gentlemen. I have not contributed much to the technical questions, the mechanics of the operations, but I consider this fundamentally even more important because it does affect all operations of the future in the outer Continental Shelf.

Mr. WILLIS. Judge?

Mr. PEREZ. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILLIS. The act of Congress admitting Louisiana into the Union, as the acts of Congress admitting all other States into the

Union, as you pointed out, described the boundaries of the admitted area.

Mr. PEREZ. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILLIS. With respect to that act of Congress admitting Louisiana, that act refers to the coast and not the shore, does it not?

Mr. PEREZ. That is right, sir.

Mr. WILLIS. It says that Louisiana is bounded on the south by the Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. PEREZ. Yes.

Mr. WILLIS. Including islands.

Mr. PEREZ. All of the area, comprehending all islands, within 3 leagues from the coast.

Mr. WILLIS. Three leagues from the coast?

Mr. PEREZ. From the coast.

Mr. WILLIS. So that is the act of Congress.

Mr. PEREZ. That is it.

Mr. WILLIS. Then the first constitution of Louisiana which was required to be adopted by the act mentions the same description?

Mr. PEREZ. In the preamble it contained exactly the same description; yes, sir.

Mr. WILLIS. Then the Submerged Lands Act that we passed again refers to the coastline.

Mr. PEREZ. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILLIS. Where do they get the Chapman argument and the Secretary of State argument about the shoreline? Where do they get that from?

Mr. PEREZ. I can tell you, sir, because I represented Louisiana in the controversy with the United States at that time—that was in 1950—and Perlman was the Solicitor General. They call it the Chapman line, because he was the Interior Secretary at the time. That actually is the Perlman line. Perlman just took a pencil and drew that line. And I can tell you something more in connection with that Perlman line or Chapman line. If you will look at the Perlman line you will notice how east of the river, for instance, inside of Breton Sound, it comes way in near shore and then it goes out again, and then at East Bay, between South Pass and Southwest Pass, it does the same thing. It comes way inside and goes out again. Well, there was an oilfield in both of those areas, and they were just cutting into those oilfields without any guide to go by. As a matter of fact, neither Perlman, the Solicitor General, nor Chapman, the Interior Secretary, had any authority under any act of Congress to define any line, shore, or coast. Originally in 1807, the authority to have surveyed and to mark the coastline was given by Congress to the President; in 1895 that authority was given to the Secretary of the Treasury; in 1913 to the Secretary of Commerce, and in 1948 under the Reorganization Plan No. 1, that authority was given to the Commandant of the Coast Guard. There is a booklet published by the Commandant of the Coast Guard showing just where that coastline runs. There is no mystery about it. The coastline as the House Judiciary Committee defined it in its report in 1953 is simply the outer boundary of inland waters where the sea begins.

Mr. WILLIS. Where it comes in contact. Here is the language.

Mr. PEREZ. And the coastline is also defined in the Submerged Lands Act in the same way.

Mr. WILLIS. Other corollary language. But the term "coastline" means the line of ordinary low water along that portion of the coast which is in direct contact with the open sea.

Mr. PEREZ. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILLIS. And whether it is 3 miles from that point. What bothers me is why should there be such a mystery about a coastline and a shoreline?

Mr. PEREZ. There should not be any mystery at all.

Mr. WILLIS. I do not want to go into the question of 3 miles versus 10 miles. That is not even before the Supreme Court.

Mr. PEREZ. No, sir, I would not take that for granted, sir.

Mr. WILLIS. Well—

Mr. PEREZ. The old cannon-shot rule—I expect to see the court say 3 miles from shore—the Chapman line.

Mr. KEATING. May I ask a question?

This has been a most interesting presentation here.

This was a very illuminating statement you made, Judge.

Has this position that you presented here been presented to the Supreme Court?

Mr. PEREZ. Yes, sir. As a matter of fact, I would like to file with your committee, and I deleted that part which is irrelevant here, a booklet which we prepared and filed with the Supreme Court. The Louisiana coastal parishes had filed or attempted to file an intervention in the suit against Louisiana on this boundary question, and showed that our boundaries ran coextensively with that of the State and therefore we had an interest, that we were entitled to a percentage of the State's severance tax and oil royalties for certain purposes to be applied within our parishes. However, the Supreme Court rejected our intervention without hearing.

Mr. KEATING. Rejected it?

Mr. PEREZ. Yes, sir.

I filed a brief in connection with it and I would like to file it with your committee, because in that we refute every contention made by the Attorney General or Solicitor General for the United States of its claim to this 3-mile cannon-shot belt. We quote from Secretary Dulles' letter, for instance, which was attached to a brief filed by the Attorney General in that case which was based principally on the Jefferson 3-mile statement in his letter in 1793, and we cite the Jefferson repudiation of that letter as meaning that it was approval of a 3-mile belt. As a matter of fact, he said our boundary should extend to the Gulf Stream because that was a natural boundary. We show that Jefferson even equipped a force to cruise within our seas, to arrest all vessels of those descriptions found hovering on our coast within the limits of the Gulf Stream. We refer to the 1807 act of Congress. Secretary Dulles, I think, had quoted Secretary Seward for a 3-mile-belt statement, and we show that Secretary Seward negotiated the treaty for the purchase of Alaska from Russia, the boundary of which was fixed at 10 marine leagues from the coast, and that certainly showed that Mr. Seward was not an advocate of a 3-mile belt when he negotiated the Alaska treaty going out 10 leagues from the coast.

That is the kind of stuff which the Attorney General's Office and the State Department are using in their efforts to restrict the State's historic boundaries to 3 miles from shore, and thereby throw this vast area into the outer Continental Shelf, or international waters, jurisdiction over which lies in the International Court of Justice.

How we may come out in the future, we do not know, but we can expect that our enemies are pretty smart, and I think they have proven that lately. They are not going to overlook this bet to embarrass the United States.

Mr. KEATING. How can Russia claim this property?

Mr. PEREZ. How can Russia claim it?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. PEREZ. International waters do not belong to anyone. Russia is too smart to come into the International Court and sue the United States, but Russia has a lot of satellites. Russia could easily influence some of our southern neighbors, through financed corporations organized under their laws, with drilling permits from their governments in developed areas. Some other country or government may back up their licensees to oper-

ate in proven areas of the outer Continental Shelf sooner or later. That would bring the issue squarely before the International Court of Justice.

Mr. KEATING. How could any other specific country claim it?

Mr. PEREZ. The same as the United States Government claims what lies in those international waters. Finally, with an adverse decision of the International Court against the United States, it may wind up in the United Nations. We do not know. I cannot predict just what would happen, except we would be prevented from exploiting the resources in the outer Continental Shelf beyond State boundaries to the exclusion of nationals of other nations. In that case whatever laws Congress may pass regulating those operations in that vast area would be unenforceable.

Mr. KEATING. I do not see how any tribunal with any jurisdiction could stop the United States from exploiting that area.

Mr. PEREZ. The International Court of Justice undoubtedly has jurisdiction, and they could have stopped Norway, as they said in their decision, if Norway's title had not been based on an 1812 decree of the Norwegian Crown, or historic title. They said otherwise Norway's claim would be in conflict with international law. In that same case they held that the 3-mile belt, the 10-mile headland rule, and the Boggs formula had no accepted place in international law. The decisive question was historic title. The States have it. The Federal Government through their representatives now are trying to destroy that historic title. Where it will end, we do not know.

I feel sure the International Court of Justice can prevent the United States from interfering with nationals of other governments from exploiting the resources in the international waters or outer Continental Shelf. It is a serious question. The men who are in office today playing politics as they are with the future welfare of the country and who will be out of politics in a relatively short time, compared with time as it goes with the Nation and the States, will have done their country and the people of the States a great disservice. They are at the helm now and we are practically helpless as States.

Mr. WILLIS. Do you have a question, Governor Tuck?

Mr. TUCK. I have no questions.

I would like to say I appreciate personally the message that the judge has brought us. I certainly am one among those who deprecate the fact that the Federal Government seems to be using so much of its powers to abridge the right of the States and seems to have less concern for the powers exercised by these foreign countries.

Mr. PEREZ. Mr. Chairman, I would like to leave these for you. I will mark them Perez 1 and 2. If you care to incorporate them, I think they contain all of the substance and historical references on the subject.

Mr. KEATING. I do not see, Mr. Chairman, where it has any bearing on the hearings we are concerned with.

Mr. WILLIS. We will have it for our file but not for the record.

Mr. FRAZIER. I have no questions.

I just want to thank the judge for appearing here and elucidating this question. I think it has a fair amount of importance to the people of the United States as well as Louisiana.

Mr. PEREZ. That little booklet treats of the historic boundaries of various Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific boundaries.

Mr. WILLIS. Thank you, Judge.

Mr. PEREZ. Thank you, gentlemen.

Albert Gallatin: Great American Statesman and Founder of House Committee on Ways and Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 30, 1958

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, January 29, it was our privilege to celebrate the 197th anniversary of the birth, in Geneva, Switzerland, of a man who was fated to become one of the legendary titans of America's fabled period of colonial growth and development. He was Albert Gallatin, and his name deserves to occupy a permanent place in the affections of the American people, akin to that long held by the names of Washington, Jefferson, and Madison.

At different times throughout his life, Albert Gallatin served the infant Republic as a State legislator, as Congressman, as Senator, as Secretary of Treasury, and as America's Ambassador to England and to the Republic of France. From his early youth, therefore, until he was well past the age of 80, Gallatin labored incessantly for the safeguarding and improvement of America's system of democratic government, and for the creation of a stable system of peaceful relations with all the other nations of the world.

To embody his determination to bring the tax, fiscal, and trade policies of the executive branch of the Government under the firm control of the elected representatives of the people, Gallatin became the original founder and one of the first members of the House Ways and Means Committee, of which I am proud to be a current member.

I consider it one of the special privileges of my committee to carry forward into the present time the tradition and teachings of Gallatin. It will soon be the responsibility of that committee to frame new legislation for the extension of reciprocal trade authority. If Gallatin were here today to share this labor I know that he would counsel us to act only on the basis of our concern for national welfare, and in the spirit of his own message on trade to Congress in 1832, in which he said:

It is commerce which unites the nations of the civilized world * * * It is principally to commerce that we are indebted for modern civilization.

Today, Gallatin's farsighted policy is under powerful attack by narrow protectionist forces. As you well know, one of the unfortunate victims of the misguided zeal of these protectionists is Switzerland, the land of Gallatin's birth. For the past 4 years America's imports of Switzerland's world-famed watches have been the object of a campaign of restriction and harassment almost without precedent in our history of commercial foreign relations.

We all recognize that America's ties with the entire Free World are now challenged by the powerful, divisive force of Soviet collectivism. To cope with this challenge we must revive Gallatin's principles on trade as the guide to our future action. We must renew and strengthen our commercial ties to what Gallatin called the nations of the civilized world. We can accomplish this vital task, only if the Members of the House can approach their job in the spirit of the founder of the House Ways and Means Committee—the great Albert Gallatin.

Address of Hon. William M. Colmer, of Mississippi, at Dedication of Keesler Air Force Base Hospital

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. ARTHUR WINSTEAD

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 30, 1958

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable BILL COLMER, one of the most outstanding Members of this Congress, delivered an inspiring speech at Keesler Air Force Base, January 11, 1958. Under unanimous consent, I include his address in the RECORD. It follows:

General Sutherland, Dr. Fisackerly, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am deeply honored to be invited to be with you here today on this momentous occasion. As we gather here today to dedicate this magnificent new hospital, it is natural for us to think of it in terms of its material attributes. We take pride in the neat, clean wards, the gleaming laboratories, the germ-free operating rooms, and the spotless kitchens. We are proud of the efficient design expressed in architectural forms of harmony and beauty. We are proud of these things because they express to us our high American achievements in architecture and in the many disciplines that go to make up the science of medicine. And aside from the physical structure which we formally dedicate today, we take justifiable pride in the skill, the spirit, and the devotion to duty of the men and women who staff this monument to modern medical science.

It is right and fitting that we should take pride in these things, and yet it seems to me that a hospital is more than the sum of its material parts, however excellent these may be. A hospital is both a symbol and a reminder. It is a symbol of our national ideals, and it is a reminder of the price that we may have to pay to preserve these ideals inviolate in a world made hideous with the specter of a ruthless conspiracy dedicated to world domination and the extermination of the spirit of freedom.

Moreover, as a Mississippian, I anticipate, with considerable comfort and pride, the contribution this most modern institution will make to the medical advancement in my beloved State. This is well. In fact, it is most comforting to us to observe the splendid spirit of cooperation existing at all times between the people of Biloxi, and Mississippians generally, on the one hand, and the Keesler leadership and personnel on the other. There is, and always has been, a minimum of conflict between the two. The absence of this harmony has so often marred this coveted relationship in other localities.

I should, therefore, like to congratulate both our city and Federal officials upon this proper and happy situation. Sacrifices have been made on both sides. They must continue in the interest of harmony and the perpetuation of this proud and valuable asset to Biloxi and the Mississippi coast.

This building is a very special sort of symbol because it is a special sort of hospital. While it is true that members of other branches of our armed services and their dependents will become beneficiaries of this great institution, it is primarily an Air Force hospital. As such, it symbolizes many things. For example, it symbolizes the imagination, the daring and the heroism of the men who work in the very specialized field of air medicine. It is these men who have made it possible for us to exert the instrument of airpower throughout the terrestrial globe by helping to discover and develop the techniques of survival in the vastness of the Arctic, in desert wastelands, and in the shark-infested seas.

We pay tribute to these men, for without them our airpower would remain forever earthbound, denied the capability of moving heavenward beyond the stratosphere and into the far reaches of interstellar space, where clearly the future of airpower lies, and where, it is quite possible, the decisive battles of the future will be fought, should war come.

But this hospital is not only a symbol. It is a reminder as well. It is a reminder that the men who wear the uniform live in peril in peacetime as well as in war, and daily risk their lives to guard the air approaches through which an enemy might attack us. It is a reminder, too, that if our airpower deterrent to war should fail, it will be not only those in uniform, but civilians as well, such of us as may survive, who will desperately need the services that hospitals like this one can provide. It is a reminder that the stakes that lie on the table today are nothing less than our national survival, a reminder of the stern realities that require of us so much of our national effort and of our personal treasure.

I have spoken of this hospital as a symbol of the achievements of aeromedicine, but, of course, it symbolizes many other things as well. It symbolizes, for example, our knowledge and conviction that our American youth is our greatest and our most precious national asset. It symbolizes our concern for their welfare and our realization that, without these dedicated men and women, our most ingenious instruments of defense would be useless and incapable of keeping the enemy at bay.

It used to be the fashion to believe that the coming of the age of so-called push-button warfare would require that we maintain in uniform fewer and fewer people with lesser and lesser skills. Unfortunately, this belief has proved to be only half true. It is probably true that ultimately we will require fewer people in our Military Establishment, but it is also true that a higher percentage of them will have to be trained and skillful technicians.

It is an inexorable fact that the more sophisticated our weapons become, the greater is our requirement for men and women with the capacity to absorb the highly technical training necessary if they are to maintain and operate these complex weapons, and who have the willingness to devote their talents to a career that imposes many physical and emotional hardships upon its members, while granting them few material rewards.

The time has passed when we could measure the strength of a military establishment by the number of bodies it contains. Today the strength of our Military Establishment lies in the sum of the skills that its members possess and in the proportion of these skills to the jobs to be performed.

We are all increasingly aware that we have not, in the past, made the fullest use of this, our most precious national asset, our youth. We have allowed too many of our young people to enter upon maturity with their full potentialities unrealized. We have too often permitted our armed services to become mere training schools for industry, by failing to provide the incentives that would keep our skilled people in uniform.

This hospital symbolizes not merely our concern for the material well-being of our young men and women who wear the uniform. It expresses as well our new concern that they be freed of anxiety for the health and welfare of their loved ones, whether they, themselves, are at home or in distant places, far away.

But, Mr. Chairman, in our evaluation and admiration of this magnificent structure, its most modern equipment and the patriotic men and women whom it will serve, it would seem appropriate also to briefly consider the overall picture of the Republic's defense. This is peculiarly true in the light of the spectacular advances made by our potential enemy, the Russians, in the field of long-range missiles and outer-space gadgets. These achievements should neither be surprising nor discounted. Certainly, we should not become panicky about them. Why should we suddenly panic over the launching by the Russians of a rocket-propelled satellite into outer space? Is our memory so short that we have forgotten that at the end of World War II Germany was far ahead of the Allies in the development of long-range rockets and missiles? And, moreover, under our appeasement policy at the conclusion of that war we permitted the Soviets to capture and transport to Russia many of the leading German scientists, who were responsible for that achievement.

The fact that Russia is ahead of us in this particular field does not necessarily mean that America is impotent to defend itself. There is good and sound reason to believe that in all other avenues of warfare, the striking power of America is superior to that of the slave kingdom of the Communist leaders.

In spite of all of the hysteria and propaganda, it is most difficult to believe that a nation as backward and undeveloped as Russia less than two decades ago has overnight, through slave-like methods, developed a super race of people and a monopoly in the world of science.

Despite the propaganda value of the sputnik, the Kremlin masters are possibly more aware than the average American citizen of the gigantic striking power of our own long, as well as short range missiles and the greatest Air Force in the world. They dare not test the retaliatory power of these machines of destruction.

Surely, prudence would suggest that, under these conditions, this new turn of events in the cold war should be met with cool, sober, and deliberate action. The challenge thus posed should be met. But we must not permit ourselves to be misled into charging off in all directions and thus destroy our own economy and institutions.

Let us ever be mindful of the fact that the blueprint laid out by the chief architect of communism, and still the Communist idol, Lenin, himself, provided for ultimate victory by the destruction of the American economy.

Finally, this hospital symbolizes the awareness of all of us that we share in the heavy responsibilities that we bear as citizens of this great Republic. This is our gift to the men and women in uniform and to their families. It was bought with our dollars and it will dispense the blessings of health and the mercies of medical care only with our continued financial support.

This hospital is a living symbol of our determination that we, as American citizens, in or out of uniform, will make whatever sacrifices may be necessary that our country may lead the world into a future of peace and prosperity for all men, under God.

May this noble and magnificent structure, during its long years of usefulness, never be called upon to function in a period of active warfare.

A Report on the Canadian Gas Cases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 30, 1958

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, because of the potential impact of natural gas imports on the domestic economy and national security, I should like to review briefly the course of the so-called Canadian gas cases before the Federal Power Commission.

During the 1st session of the 85th Congress numerous Members of the House discussed the proposed pipeline from Canada to the Midwest. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] who has led the battle for more than a decade to protect America's markets from products of cheap labor abroad, joins with me in accepting the challenge of Canadian gas proponents, and I am happy to say that many other of our colleagues take a similar position. We pointed out the grave economic implications contained in the applications for this pipeline. We explained that coal miners, railroad workers, dockworkers, and employees of many allied businesses would be relegated to the rolls of the unemployed if this foreign gas were permitted to enter United States fuel markets. We reviewed the serious national defense considerations involved when any single phase of the military structure lends itself to reliance upon an uncertain supply of energy.

The controversy which has persisted in Canada over attempts of international gas dealers to vend an exhaustible commodity without first attempting to discern the extent of the Dominion's own requirements—these and other issues originating in the producing fields and echoing through the House of Commons in Ottawa were also reviewed for Members of Congress prior to adjournment in August. Dissatisfaction on the part of the Canadian press and of the general public from Nova Scotia to British Columbia was recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The full story of Canadian gas—except for that portion of it covering the mysterious financial transactions that have thus far never been opened to the public—was covered in full for the elucidation of Congress, the Federal Power Commission, the executive department, and the American people. I shall at this time proceed to examine the developments that have taken place since the adjournment of Congress.

Throughout September and most of October a parade of witnesses appeared at the Federal Power Commission hearings to present testimony and submit to cross-examination. Meanwhile, reverberations were being heard in various areas of the Dominion itself. Addressing the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, a member of the Manitoba Legislative Assembly charged that export of Canadian gas would be a scandalous sellout of an important Canadian import at the expense of Canadian producers and Canadian consumers. Taking the same position that many of us in Congress believed most feasible for the protection of Canadians and of proposed consumers in the imports' target areas of this country, he demanded establishment of a Royal Commission to investigate the Trans-Canadian Pipe Line Co., from whose facilities the projected international line would derive its supply.

Shortly thereafter, on October 15, such a commission was in fact created by Prime Minister John Diefenbaker, who told the House of Commons that no final answer could be given on the export issue until the commission has reported its findings. As directed by Mr. Diefenbaker, the commission is to study pipeline operations, including price regulation and the financial structure of the pipeline companies. The Prime Minister emphasized the necessity for conserving supplies to meet present and future Canadian requirements before granting export licenses. News sources in Canada reported that about 2 years would be needed for the commission to complete its work.

As if to accentuate the impossibility of expediting a final determination of the export issue, the Prime Minister on October 31 stated that the Government would make no decision until after the Borden—chairman—Royal Commission had completed its investigation and submitted its recommendations.

On the basis of this action by the Canadian Government, we might justifiably assume that our own Federal Power Commission would not even consider allowing the proposed foreign pipeline to enter this country at least until the matter of exports was settled in Ottawa and in affected Provinces. Nonetheless, the FPC continued its hearings as if oblivious of what was transpiring in the Dominion.

Then, in early November, another explosion jolted the pipeline applicants. It took place in the FPC hearing room during the appearance of Francis Kernan, partner in the New York firm which financed the Trans-Canada Pipe Line. Mr. Kernan admitted that appointment of the Royal Commission to study Canada's projected energy demands and to investigate the pipeline itself is a serious impediment to the Canadian-American line proposed by Tennessee Pipe Line Co. and its subsidiary, Midwestern Gas Transmission Co. He added that some clarification of this situation will be necessary before Midwestern could finance.

In consequence of this uncertainty and of other intangibles born of the question-

able relationships behind the parent pipeline, and brought into prominence by subsequent actions of the Canadian Government and through testimony before the FPC, a motion to dismiss the applications of Widwestern and its affiliate—on the grounds that they did not have an assured supply of natural gas from Canada—was filed by Fuels Research Council jointly with the National Coal Association, United Mine Workers of America, Mid-West Coal Producers Institute, Inc., the Anthracite Institute, and the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co.

Last month the Commission directed that the motion be referred to the presiding examiner for consideration and disposition after the hearing is completed and briefs are filed.

In the interim period, a large number of witnesses representing the American coal and railroad industries have testified in opposition to the Canadian gas applications. I shall not include any of the testimony in the RECORD at this time. The hearings are now nearing their conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that Members of the House and Senate keep a watchful eye on what transpires at the FPC. Committed by the Constitution to regulate foreign commerce, Congress will be responsible for enacting legislation to protect American industry and labor against this new threat if the FPC does not properly consider the anticipated impact of the proposed foreign import on American fuel industries.

Mr. Speaker, American coal production suffered a severe decline in 1957. We are in the throes of an economic situation that finds thousands of coal miners and railroad workers without employment. It is incumbent upon us as Members of Congress to seek out and remedy the policies that have brought about this distress.

To permit Canadian gas to capture markets upon which other miners and railroaders depend for subsistence would be inimical to the welfare and security of the United States. If the Federal Power Commission does not issue a finding in defense of these markets and these people, the Congress must set up a legislative barrier in their defense.

Urgent Need for Additional Capacity in Veterans Hospitals in St. Louis and Elsewhere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 30, 1958

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, from time to time over the past few years, I have been urging upon the Veterans' Administration an expansion of the present veterans hospital in St. Louis, the John J. Cochran Memorial Hospital, to meet the urgent needs of veterans in our area who

are required to wait for extended periods for necessary operations or hospital care. As originally planned, this hospital was to have been a 1,000-bed facility. That is what the Congress originally authorized. But in line with the general cut-back made by the Veterans' Administration in the size of nearly all of the new hospitals programed near the end of—or immediately after—World War II, this hospital was built as a 500-bed installation. Actually it has a rated capacity of only 487 beds.

I am distressed to point out that the waiting list now represents the full capacity of the hospital. Only a year ago, the waiting list included only about 207 eligible veterans. Now, as I said, it is over 500.

The hospital itself is operating at peak efficiency. I am proud of the way it has been run. I have never had any difficulty in obtaining immediate hospitalization for any service-connected case, and they have been most accommodating about extremely urgent emergency cases among non-service-connected cases.

But the fact remains—and it is indeed a most unfortunate and distressing fact for those directly affected—that we need a hospital twice as big as the one we have. We need a hospital of the size this hospital was originally supposed to be—of the size originally authorized and approved by the Congress.

VA HAS FULL AUTHORITY TO EXPAND HOSPITALS

Under the basic authorizing legislation, this hospital and many, many others now in operation under the Veterans' Administration could be expanded or doubled in size to meet current needs if the money were provided by Congress and if the construction were undertaken by the Administration. No new legislation would be needed other than the appropriation of the funds.

The VA, as we know, is not requesting such funds. Even if it were inclined to seek added funds for expansion of these hospitals, it could not obtain approval under the present administration from the Bureau of the Budget. So there is no initiative being taken on this by the agency involved.

I think that is most unfortunate. I think Congress, therefore, should take the initiative to recommend an expansion program for those hospitals we fully know require such expansion in order to take care of the large numbers of veterans awaiting hospitalization.

Of course Congress cannot force the administration to spend the funds even if we do provide them. There would have to be a change of thinking—a change of heart—on the part of the Budget Bureau and of the President. But perhaps if the Congress were to take the lead and make the case for expansion—as we all know can easily be done—the present administration might develop the necessary fiscal courage to go along and go ahead on such a program.

FIGURES SHOW EXTENT OF NEED

A year ago, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House conducted a study on this problem and obtained information from veterans' hospitals all over the country on the size of

their waiting lists and the needs for adequate service to those veterans entitled to hospitalization but not receiving it without extended delay.

In the case of the John J. Cochran Hospital, for instance, the record shows that with a rated-bed capacity of 487 beds, we have all of those beds in operating condition, with the full staff to maintain them. There is no problem there. We have outstanding medical training centers. The figures showed that over a 12-month period, this hospital actually operated with a daily patient load of 443. Only about half of the hospital's 39 tuberculosis beds were in daily use on the average and of the 78 neuropsychiatric beds, about 46 were utilized on a daily average basis over the 12-month period. But with a rated capacity of 370 general medical and surgical beds, the record over the 12-month period showed an average daily patient load of 379. So that part of the hospital operated above capacity.

And most of those on the waiting list at that time—a year ago—were waiting for calls for general medical or surgical attention.

What these figures which I have mentioned show—and they show it dramatically—is that our hospital in St. Louis is truly operating on a level of maximum efficiency, in that the G. M. and S. beds just never go empty. Despite the fact that the average length of stay for G. M. and S. bed patients has been 23.8 days, the turnover has been so well managed that the hospital has been operating day-in-and-day-out at capacity or overcapacity on general medical and surgical cases. This is an outstanding record, I believe.

OTHER HOSPITALS SHOW SIMILAR UTILIZATION

Just taking at random some of the other veterans' hospitals covered in the study last year made by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, we find examples like these:

Birmingham, Ala.: Operating beds, 410; average daily patient load, 361; waiting list, 76.

North Little Rock, Ark.: Rated capacity, 2,062; average daily patient load, 1,976; waiting list, 176.

Long Beach, Calif.: Operating beds, 1,380; average daily patient load, 1,329; waiting list, 178.

Palo Alto, Calif.: Operating beds, 1,400; average daily patient load, 1,339; waiting list, 948.

Bay Pines, Fla.: Operating beds, 516; average daily patient load, 496; waiting list, 444.

Augusta, Ga.: Operating beds, 1,329; average daily patient load, 1,260; waiting list, 210.

Chicago, Ill.: Operating beds, 516; average daily patient load, 454; waiting list, 88.

They are just a few, Mr. Speaker, just leafing through the study made by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs—just selecting some at random in the opening part of the study. I have not attempted to pick out the worst instances—that is, the best examples. I am just taking a few from among States in the first part of the alphabet.

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs has the full facts on all of these installations in every State. It is a most impressive story for those who will but look it over.

SITUATION PERFECT FOR EXPANSION OF ST. LOUIS HOSPITAL

Taking the case of our hospital in St. Louis, Mr. Speaker, I might point out that veterans groups there have been making studies from time to time not only on the needs of the veterans for more hospital space but on the feasibility of an expansion of this hospital.

It is located in an area of our city where expansion would be most feasible. The surrounding property would not be excessive in price, and an expansion of this hospital would be a contribution toward improving the physical area.

There is no good reason why this hospital should not be expanded. The only reason it has not been expanded is that the White House and Budget Bureau have shut their eyes to the needs.

I know, of course, that our situation in St. Louis is not the worst example in the country. Many veterans hospitals are equally in need of expansion, if not more so. Hence, we must have an overall program—expanding wherever needed—rather than have each Congressional delegation try to slip through some provision for their own area.

I would be most happy to join with Members from all districts where a similar situation exists to sponsor the necessary funds to expand our veterans hospitals to meet today's needs, as against the needs of 10 years ago. For it is a sad fact that most of the veterans hospitals that I am familiar with are built to the needs of 10 years or more ago, not to the needs of today.

Need we be reminded that the average age of our veteran population is much higher now than when the hospitals were begun, and that as our veterans age, their needs for hospitalization generally advance, at least proportionately if not at an accelerated rate.

ECONOMIC AS WELL AS HUMANITARIAN JUSTIFICATION FOR EXPANSION OF VETERANS HOSPITALS

Mr. Speaker, I would not want to give the impression I am urging expansion of veterans hospitals in order to make work—as a kind of WPA or PWA project. But the fact is that we need this added capacity for eligible deserving veterans. And the fact is also unfortunately true that we are now going deeper into recession each day of this new year.

We are going to be spending added billions for missiles and other weapons of war. We need those weapons. We need military research funds and they will be provided.

But I cannot help but notice—as we all have noticed—that the President in his economic report a few days ago made clear he was expecting these increased missile and defense expenditures to serve the added purpose of bolstering not only our defenses but our sagging economy as well.

Any money spent now and in the near future for needed veterans hospital construction would have a similar dual effect of helping our economy to revive.

I just throw that into the discussion as an added point. We are not seeking a hospital expansion program to provide employment; we are seeking it in order to provide needed hospitalization for deserving veterans. But it is worth keeping in mind that this would have a desirable economic effect, too.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we get started now on this program.

Statement of Hon. Seely-Brown on Public Law 874

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 30, 1958

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, there has been pending before the Subcommittee on General Education, Committee on Education and Labor, legislation pertaining to Public Laws 874 and 815, which I support because I believe that it is imperative that benefits extended to federally impacted areas be continued and maintained.

In this connection, my colleague, the Honorable HORACE SEELY-BROWN, Jr., appeared before the committee and gave a very excellent statement in which he supported favorable consideration of Public Law 874 as it is presently written.

I believe his presentation was an admirable one and I submit it to my colleagues for reading.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR., MEMBER OF CONGRESS, IN SUPPORT OF LEGISLATION TO EXTEND PUBLIC LAWS 874 AND 815, 81ST CONGRESS, AS AMENDED, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON GENERAL EDUCATION, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful indeed for the opportunity to present this statement in support of legislation to extend Public Laws 874 and 815 of the 81st Congress, as amended.

As we all know, when it became increasingly apparent that certain educational problems which existed during World War II were not of a temporary nature, appropriate legislation was enacted. In enacting Public Law 874, the Congress declared it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance to the local educational agencies in the areas in which certain Federal activities are carried on. The dual burden placed on school districts by Federal activities was caused mainly by a reduction in revenue available to such agencies from local sources as the result of the acquisition of real property by the United States, and the sudden and substantial increase in school attendance as a result of Federal activities. The provisions for assistance written into the law have proved to be wisely conceived and equitable in application. They insure that Federal funds will be directed to the place of immediate need and that they will be in proportion to the burden placed on the schools by a Federal activity. It was originally intended to enact Public Law 874 as permanent legislation after a 4-year trial period. Subsequent amendments to the law, and its extension from time to time, definitely indicate there is a realization that the problems toward

which Public Law 874 was directed still exist. There is no question but that the situation exists today, as it did in 1950, where a disproportionate share of the tax burden for the support of public education must be borne by the property owners of the towns where Federal or defense installations are located.

The need for a continuation of assistance to school districts in which Federal activities are carried on is well recognized by those of us whose Congressional Districts include schools affected by these activities. The aid provided in the past has become an important part of the financial structure of many Connecticut communities. The attached charts clearly indicate this to be the case. One community in my own Congressional District may be cited as a striking example, namely, the town of Groton, where almost 33½ percent of the annual budget for education has come from financial assistance provided under the terms of Public Law 874. If the law is not extended in basically its present form, the task of raising additional revenue within this town to support the educational budget will be almost insuperable.

I urge the committee to give favorable consideration to legislation to extend Public Law 874 in virtually its present form. I am, however, particularly concerned about two of its provisions. One of these is that part of the law dealing with eligibility for entitlement. I firmly believe that parents' employment on Federal property as a basis for children's eligibility should be continued. The policy of acceptance of parents' employment on Federal property as the basis for eligibility is as sound today as it was when the law was enacted, and should, in my opinion, be made permanent. Another portion of the law I am particularly anxious to see continued is that which permits the counting of children living in Federal housing sold or transferred to non-Federal ownership as federally connected for certain purposes. Under the best of conditions, there is an inevitable lapse of time before there is a local tax yield from these residences after their sale by the Federal Government. Since the grand list is made up on the basis of property ownership status as of just one particular date each year, it is conceivable that the property actually should have been taxable by the town for a period of almost 2 years before any payment is forthcoming.

In addition to being of the opinion that the law should be extended basically in toto, I feel that it should actually be liberalized to a certain extent. I hope the committee will give careful consideration to an amendment, along the lines of the following language, to subsection 3 (c) (2) of Public Law 874: Insert, after the last sentence of the subsection, which ends with the words "and would defeat the purposes of this act," the following: "In any case, when a local educational agency has established eligibility for payment for one or more fiscal years beginning July 1, 1956, and thereafter, it shall, effective with the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1957, continue to be eligible for payments under subsection 3 (c) (1) with respect to the actual number of children determined under subsection (a) or subsection (b), as the case may be, for any immediately following year or 2 successive years during which the number of children so determined amounts to less than the 3 percent stipulated in clause B of this paragraph."

The purpose of the suggested amendment is to alleviate the situation in which school districts find themselves when, after one or more years of eligibility and payment under the law, they suddenly in a succeeding year become ineligible for any payment because the ratio of their federally connected children's attendance to that of all their children has become just under the required

3 percent. A half dozen children, one way or the other, could make the difference between an eligible 3 percent and an ineligible 2.9 percent. It can readily be seen that this situation could exist in those areas where there are temporary layoffs in defense plants due to cutbacks in certain programs. This could seriously affect the financial structure of a district after eligibility at 3 percent or better has been established in prior years and payments under the Federal responsibility assumed in Public Law 874 have become normally expected dependable income.

Although I shall not dwell at length on the need for the extension of Public Law 815, I do want to go on record as favoring the continuation of this law in basically its present form. The imminent increase in Federal activity in my own area, as well as many others, due to a revision of our defense programs, will probably bring with it a large increase in school enrollments. The influx of additional workers in any given area will result in a growing need for school facilities which are already entirely inadequate to house the present school population.

The problems which these laws are directed at resolving are not theoretical ones. Since I have personal knowledge of the situation which exists in my own District and throughout Connecticut, and since I know this is a matter of vital concern to so many people, I earnestly and respectfully request favorable consideration by the committee on legislation to extend Public Laws 874 and 815 as recommended by me in this statement.

Federal Assistance to Areas of Persistent Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 30, 1958

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the House to a recommendation made by President Eisenhower in both his budget message and economic report. It is a recommendation for Federal assistance to areas of persistent unemployment.

In his budget message, the President emphasized:

I repeat my recommendation of last year for the prompt enactment of appropriate authority under which communities with basic problems of persistent unemployment can be assisted in their solution.

In his economic report, the President repeated:

Earlier economic reports recommended a Federal program to stimulate sound economic development in areas of persistent unemployment. Legislation previously recommended to provide an Area Assistance Administration in the Department of Commerce, to extend loans, research grants, and technical assistance to such areas, should be enacted.

Thus we see that the President recognizes the urgent need for this legislation to aid depressed communities. Unemployment is a problem that should take a back seat to none, including national defense. It would be the worst of follies to concentrate exclusively on military power while at the same time allowing our economic health to degenerate.

Yet this is the danger we face unless immediate action is taken to reverse a disturbing trend toward increasing unemployment. An unhappy example of this trend is seen in the twin towns of Biddeford and Saco in my First District of Maine. These once prosperous towns are now severely depressed with high unemployment caused mainly by a decline in textile manufacturing. Approximately 2,000 workers lost their jobs in 1957.

These people are making a supreme effort to help themselves in the tradition of Yankee self-reliance. They have formed an industrial development committee to attract new industries to the area, which has an abundance of available skilled labor and manufacturing sites and buildings. An industrial building authority established by the State legislature in 1957 also could help bring industry and jobs to such areas.

But these persevering people lack the resources to do it all by themselves. They need the monetary and technical assistance that only the Federal Government can provide. The citizens of Biddeford and Saco are not unique. The people of many other communities are faced with similar problems.

Congress already has waited too long. It should not be necessary for an army of unemployed to march on the Capitol to cause the enactment of appropriate legislation. The need for action is apparent. It has been underlined by the President. Further delay will mean further unemployment.

Other measures to aid small business in such communities also should receive immediate attention. These would provide tax benefits, an increase in business and disaster loans by the Small Business Administration, and stronger

antitrust laws to foster free competition for small firms. The President has urged action on these three fronts also.

My legislation to give small concerns a better tax break, provide low-interest loans in areas of unemployment, and put the Small Business Administration on a permanent basis would help considerably to strengthen the important small business segment of our economy and increase job opportunities in towns like Biddeford and Saco.

The plight of these two towns—typical of others throughout the country—is pictured in an article, *A Tale of Two Cities*, which my colleague, Senator PAYNE of Maine, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Tuesday, January 28. I think this article is worth your reading, because it graphically emphasizes the need for early consideration of appropriate legislation.